0841 Pam

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California



METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1873.

VOLUME LV.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXV.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
NELSON & PHILLIPS.
CINCINNATI: HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1873.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

THEODORE PARKER 5
Rev. George Prentice, Professor in Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE PEOPLE 43
Rev. A. Stevens, LL.D., Brooklyn, N. Y

PETER CARTWRIGHT, AND PREACHING IN THE WEST. (Second Article.) 69
M. Cucheval-Clavigny. From the Revue des Deux Mondes.

THE KU-KLUX CONSPIRACY 89
S. G. Arnold, Esq., Washington, D. C.

YOUNG ROUMANIA 111
Professor William Wells, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 130

Foreign Religious Intelligence 144

Foreign Literary Intelligence 150

Quarterly Book-Table 154

Bledsoe's Theodicy, page 154; Hickok's Humanity Immortal, 159; Edward's Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects, and Bushnell's Sermons on Living Subjects, 163; Charnock's Discourses on the Attributes of God, 163; Chalmers's Sermons and Discourses, 163; Read's Foot-Prints of Satan, 164; Porter's From Atheism to Christianity, 164; Böhl's Allgemeine Pädagogik, 164; Meyer's Weltelend und Weltschmerz. (World-woe and World-wail,) en Rede, 165; Weber's Die Entstehung der menschlichen Sprache, etc., 166; Sulzberger's Christliche Glaubenslehre vom Methodistischen Standpunkt, (Methodist Dogmatics,) 167; Nicholson's Introduction to the Study of Biology, 168; Duke of Argyll's Primeval Man, 169; Day's Science of Æsthetics, 171; Works of Rev. Robert Murray M'Cheyne, 172; Anderson's History of Missions of the Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches, 172; Brunson's Western Pioneer, 173; Jacoby's History of Methodism, 174; Nordhoff's California for Health, Pleasure, and Residence, 175; Harmon's Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land in 1869–70, 176; Plumer's Döllinger's Fables respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, 176; Hart's Manual of American Literature, 177; Comfort's German Reader, 177; Longfellow's Divine Tragedy, Whittier's Pennsylvania Pilgrim, and other Poems, and Taylor's Masque of the Gods, 178; Miscellaneous, 179.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, 1873.

Art. I.—THEODORE PARKER.

Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. By John Weiss. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1864.

Miss Cobbe's Edition of Parker's Works.

The Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, written and edited by John Weiss, appeared about eight years ago, some four years after Mr. Parker had fallen asleep under the sunny skies of Italy. It is the work of a personal friend of the man whose history it records and whose memory it embalms. It is rumored that Mr. Weiss undertook this biography in accordance with the express desire of the deceased, though he himself professes to derive his authority and opportunity to write only from Mrs. Parker. The author evidently feels a profound enthusiasm for his subject, and displays a courageous devotion to the doctrines and principles to whose exposition and propagation Parker's life was given. He accords the fullest credit to every statement from the lips of his departed friend, and gleans up with filial piety such scraps from his voluminous journal, and such letters from his vast correspondence, as shed any ray of light upon his career and opinions. Studied in connection with his published works, this Life enables us to contemplate and estimate Parker, no longer under the glint of crossing swords and in the blaze of eager controversy, but leisurely, calmly, with patience, and a judgment undisturbed by

the heats of affection. It is well that the record of the Works and Days of Parker was made by warm friends whose love was frequently too much for their judgment, since in this way we obtain a better opportunity to study and comprehend the man. To accept the showing of these ardent admirers, we should find him one of the noblest specimens of manly and saintly character which has blossomed in the thick and heavy atmosphere of our degenerate day. If such partiality sometimes inflicts too much indiscriminate eulogy on the impatient reader, it has the decided merit of trying to unfold Parker's story as far as possible in his own language.

The family from which Theodore Parker sprang traces its history back to certain dwellers in Browsholme, a hamlet of York County in England. The name indicates their social standing and quality as foresters or park-keepers. There were Quakers and Puritans and a brace of Non-Conforming clergymen among those who bore the name in the mother country. Some branch of the family had attained the dignity of a coat-of-arms with an ample blazon of leopards' heads, stars, and with a stag pierced by an arrow for a crest. Their motto was "*Semper aude*"—a motto which at least one of their race was to obey in a spirit which might even have provoked the admiration of Danton with his "Audacity, audacity, audacity forever!"

Thomas Parker came to America in 1635, in a vessel fitted out by Sir Richard Saltonstall. He settled at Lynn, Massachusetts, and was made a freeman in 1637. As one of the original settlers in the town, forty acres of land were assigned him; this tract is included within the limits of the present town of Saugus. In 1640 he removed to Reading. He was one of seven who formed the first Church gathered in that ancient town, and in 1637 he was chosen one of its deacons. He rejoiced in six sons and four daughters, and died, in 1683, at the advanced age of seventy-four. His descendants grew and multiplied; they were solid and reliable men of the sort that view land, teach school, drill and train militiamen, have the itch for fighting in their very bones, and delight in the titles of lieutenant and captain. They were not remarkably thrifty people, and their one famous son might have said of them in the lump, as Lord Brougham did of his forefathers, that he had not

been able to discover that any of them had ever been remarkable for any thing. Now and then a touch of pure and manly Christian piety appears among their dusty and yellow papers; but Mr. Weiss seems suspicious that all such weaknesses came into the family from an occasional intermarriage with deacons' daughters.

In 1710 John Parker, a grandson of Thomas, removed from Reading, with all his children and grandchildren save one son, to Lexington, then known as Cambridge Farms. Here they settled on a tract of land, part of which still remains in possession of the family. They were rudely skilled in a great variety of employments, and, as is apt to be the case with such, were nicely skilled in nothing. Their education was mostly self-conducted, and commonly resulted in just enough knowledge to enable them to keep their accounts in a manner that would be a deep grief to the soul of the modern schoolmaster, bent on the education of mankind. John Parker, the grandfather of Theodore, was born in this place in 1729. He had the traditional military instincts of the family in full measure; he was sergeant in the old French and Indian war, and carried a light fowling-piece at the surrender of Quebec. Returning to peace and the pursuits of agriculture at the close of that struggle, we have no further glimpse of him until the outbreak of the American Revolution. His minister, the Rev. Jonas Clark, not only preached politics from the pulpit, but had a hand in some of the active measures which hastened the outbreak of hostilities. His parishioners were mostly of his own way of thinking, and they formed a company of minute-men to prepare for resistance to the British. Of this company Sergeant Parker became captain. At one o'clock on the morning of the 19th of April, 1775, word came to Captain Parker, who lived about three miles from the village green, that regular officers were riding up and down the road insulting and capturing honest folks. Though ill in body, he hastened to the scene of danger, consulted with the minister and others whom he found there, and resolved not to risk his slender force of seventy raw men against nine hundred regular soldiers unless subjected to abuse or molestation. The Government forces came up and poured out three volleys on the rebels, killing seven and wounding eight. After returning a feeble and scat-

tering fire, the militia were ordered to disperse and take care of themselves. The country rose to repel the enemy, and the English speedily beat a retreat toward Boston. Captain Parker was too ill to join vigorously in the pursuit. He was present and in command of troops on the 17th of June following, at the battle of Bunker Hill, but had not the felicity to be called into action. In the next September he died, and we humbly trust has never encountered Theodore in the unseen world. The latter cites the words of his grandfather, as attested thirty-five years later by his orderly sergeant, to show that Captain Parker desired the war to begin then and there, if war was really meant; also that he held his men bravely to their work until he thought best to disperse them. He states these items in a letter to the historian Bancroft, and thinks they should be preserved to future generations. We do what we can to assist this honorable and pious design, though with some misgivings over the well-known elasticity of memory in veteran survivors of famous battles. Vanish, O homespun Captain, from the scene of human affairs! Vainly shall obscurity clutch at thy name. Thou didst head the column of American democracy in its earliest bloody conflict with royal power, and therefore shall thy humble name be had in remembrance in all the earth.

But before Captain Parker had stumbled upon unexpected immortality, was born to him another John Parker, Feb. 14, 1761. This son was father to Theodore, and is therefore of great interest to us. He married Hannah Stearns of Lexington; their domestic life was peaceful and happy. Here are sketches of them as they appeared to Theodore. The father was more a mechanic than farmer, and left the farm-work mainly to his boys, while he made and mended wheels, pumps, and farming-tools. He was very fond of books, and used to read aloud in the long winter evenings to wife and children. When the clock told the hour of eight, a wave of the reader's hand dismissed the juniors to bed. He was stoutly built, able-bodied, ingenious, and industrious. He had studied algebra, geometry, and was a master-hand at figures; he talked well, and might have become an orator. He did not like debate, though his ability in it was conspicuous. He had a love for metaphysics, psychology, and all branches of mental and moral

philosophy, and had read all the works on philosophy. He slept but five hours, and rose before day for study. He was acute in philosophical analysis, jovial and funny, but lacked the exuberant and grotesque mirthfulness of his famous son. He was good-mannered, and not clownish, profane, or indecent in his humor. He was inclined to think for himself in religion, and *hated* Jonathan Edwards and Paley. "Paley left us no conscience," was his verdict on that writer. He denied eternal punishment, and rejected the more extravagant miracles of the Bible. But he read the Scriptures with assiduity, and, on Sunday evenings, taught his little ones the ten commandments, prayers, and hymns. He was a Unitarian in theology, before there was any such religious body in the land. He did not like poetry, but read Milton, Dryden, Shakspeare, Pope, Trumbull, Peter Pindar, and Abraham Cowley. In later life he was fond of novels. He was a Federalist when only four others were to be found in his native town. He was just, fearless, a lover of peace, administered estates, and was guardian for widows and orphans. He was not thrifty, was a wise friend of education, and never grew rich. He took much pains with the intellectual and moral training of his family.

The mother was handsome, delicate, slightly-built, industrious, thrifty, and generous to the poor. She loved to hear her husband read of an evening, while the family sewing or knitting busied her restless hands; and she was fond of simple ballads and popular tales. Her familiarity with the Scriptures was unusual, and she had her favorite hymns. She had delicacy of mind, and a dainty imagination. Doctrines were in no great esteem with her, though she belonged to the Church and had all her babes duly christened. She was free from bigotry, cant, and fear. She took love and good works for religion. She bred up her family in such piety as she herself had, and kept all bigoted reading out of the household. Her manners were grave and gentle, but touched with the old Puritan state, till the mild blue eyes sometimes grew austere. She taught the children to repeat their prayers, after her careful hand had tucked them up snugly in bed for the night.

Such a picture deserves our careful examination. When a great man of any sort appears, he is rarely unheralded by kinsmen who foreshadow his best qualities. From his worthy

father Theodore Parker inherited strength of body, ability in speech, love of metaphysics, *hatred* of Paley and Jonathan Edwards, disbelief in some of the miracles in the Bible, reverence for the Scriptures, Unitarian theology, such natural virtues as he had, love of learning, and habits of diligence in labor and study. It is implied, though not directly asserted, that his father's view of the inspiration of the sacred writers was much the same that Theodore carried with him, in 1834, to the Cambridge Divinity School. Theodore's taste for poetry, hard as he strove to mold it aright, was essentially derived from his father; for what he wrote and what he cites from others is nearly always didactic and rhetorical, very rarely of an imaginative quality. If his mother had the delicate mind and fine gifts of imagination which are ascribed to her, she did not communicate them to her noted son. It seems that Hannah Stearns ministered to the spiritual welfare of her children so far as it was attended to in the home circle. When she had stout Theodore baptized, he kicked and struggled, protested, and inquired what it all meant. She shared in their rehearsals of prayer, sought to make them well-bred and honest, and in particular strove to render them obedient to conscience. The father forbade the school-teacher to instruct his youngest child in the Westminster Catechism. The mother did not meddle with the personal religious life of her offspring. The only incident of the early years of Theodore which reveals her in her natural and solemn office as the religious teacher of her child is thus described: "I had lifted my hand to smite a turtle when a voice within me said clear and loud, 'It is wrong!' . . . I hastened home and told my mother the tale, and asked her what it was that told me it was wrong? She wiped a tear from her eye with her apron, and, taking me in her arms, said, 'Some men call it conscience, but I prefer to call it the voice of God in the soul of man. If you listen and obey it, then it will speak clearer and clearer, and always guide you right; but if you turn a deaf ear or disobey, then it will fade out little by little, and leave you in the dark and without a guide. Your life depends on heeding this little voice."

Assuming the exactness of this account, (though we shall learn that we cannot always depend on Theodore's memory in such details,) the following things are to be noted. The

influence of the home was not religious in the scriptural sense of that term. Mr. Parker was not a member of the Church, was an inconsistent believer in miracles and the inspiration of the Scriptures, rejected the deity of Jesus Christ and those notions of experimental piety which depend entirely upon that dogma, and, I fear, *hated* the religious life of Edwards and Paley quite as much as their erroneous doctrines. Such was the intellectual and theological atmosphere in which the active mind of Theodore expanded. It is not to be supposed that such notions were an autochthonous growth in the mind of this sturdy yeoman. The air was full of them. Unitarianism was not, like the prophet's gourd, the growth of a single night. Any reader of the sermons of that period knows how utterly the real and grand inspiration of Puritanism had deserted the pulpit of Eastern Massachusetts. The clergy was a virtual aristocracy, and, like every privileged class, inclined rather to ease than to action. They naturally favored such doctrines as could be reconciled with a life of comfortable and respectable leisure. For two generations no man had lifted up his voice with the fervor that made Robinson's hearers inquire after every sermon, "Whose heart has the Lord touched to-day?" When Whitefield, more than a century ago, preached with his wonted energy and effect in Cambridge, the faculty of Harvard College printed their testimony against him as a dangerous innovator. Most of the churches were closed to him, and what good was accomplished by his efforts was well-nigh swallowed up in the controversy that ensued on the lawfulness of his itinerant labors. The clergy fell into a reaction against Puritan piety. The deity of Christ, the utter sinfulness of human nature, the atoning character of Christ's sufferings and death, the need and the possibility of regeneration, the eternity of punishment for sin, the consciousness of pardon, the reality of the Spirit's presence with the true Church, all were more or less clearly denied. It was the most natural thing in the world, then, that a man like John Parker should have gleaned up these ideas from sermons in church and from conversation out of it.

Mrs. Parker was not of sufficient intellectual ability to correct these erroneous notions of religion. She admired her husband and shared his views. But she had a natural instinct for

godliness, and under better circumstances might have matched the mothers of Augustine and Wesley or the wife of Edwards. So far as her influence went, it seems to me pure as water and sweet as bread. But I am struck with the absence of certain elements in her religious instruction. She taught her children to say their prayers, and that was all; to read the Scriptures, but not to recognize in them the law of life; to do right, but not their need of righteousness before God. When Theodore was so startled at the voice of conscience she neither told him to pray, nor prayed with him that grace might be ever given him to obey its solemn behests. Such were the mature parents to whom on the 10th of August, 1810, Theodore Parker was born. The father was in his fiftieth year, the mother in her forty-seventh.

The place where he passed his early years could only be attractive to one who had fond associations connected with it. The writer recalls with amusement his only visit, eight years since, to the spot. After a week of those easterly winds and chilly rains that vex the eastern coasts of New England, the weather cleared and nature smiled in sudden gladness. The earth was fragrant with flowers; the heaven was soft and of an unusually deep blue, flecked with fleecy clouds; the brooks were noisier than usual with their sweet bubble; the distant fields beyond Waltham were clad in tender green, which contrasted admirably with the light pinkish tints of the oak groves that lined the hillsides, and choirs of tuneful birds filled the air with various melody; the blackbird, the thrush, and catbird were trilling their best notes; the yellowbird and an occasional meadow-lark were on duty as vocalists; while bobolinks deluged the ear with their rollicking strains. Such was the scene through which the road meandered to the birthplace of Parker. Reaching a crossing, a man and a boy mending the highway were challenged with the inquiry, "Where was Theodore Parker born?" Both leaned on their spades, stared at the traveler, looked at each other, and then the man said, "Dunno." "Are you new-comers here?" "No, sir—lived here man an' boy nigh on to forty year." "Well, are there no Parkers about here?" After consultation the man said, "Yes, there's tew lots on 'em." "I wish to find the *old* Parker place," said the tourist. "Older'n

creation, both on 'em," he responded. "The *Captain* Parker place," the inquirer added. "They run to cappens," said he; "but I guess you had better take that ar road to the left and go about a mile, then turn down a lane, and at the end there's a monnerment that must be set up for Cappen Parker." "O yes," said I, "he was captain in the Revolution." "Was he? Waal! I dunno; some fellers from Baws'n cum up and did it a while ago." Thus directed the place was soon found, and a sight obtained of the monument set up by the care of John R. Manley to his deceased minister. Verily, the places that know us shall know us no more!

The farm is small and poor. The house is not the one in which Theodore was born, but smaller than that as pictured in Weiss's Life. The old bell-tower remains. The broad ledge, the distant double-headed pine; the ash-tree planted by Theodore, which always bore two crops of leaves until the year of his death and then ceased its freak; the broad meadow, the orchard, and the woods, all were there much as he had known them. But, best of all, Isaac Parker, a brother ten years older than the famous minister, was still there, more than glad to tell all he could remember about his junior's early life. But, as Weiss had seen him, no new facts were elicited from his lips. Yet to see him, to hear him talk of his mother and of Theodore, was truly a revelation. Here was another Parker with all the natural traits of the deceased—prompt and easy speech; warm, quick feelings, that often made the voice husky and the eyes tearful. It was a good place to be born in for bodily and moral health.

Theodore learned to handle tools in his father's shop, and to wield the implements of toil on the farm. Thus were acquired habits of industry, a well-developed frame, and great physical endurance.

The boy was sent to the district school summer and winter until 1817; after that date he attended only the winter sessions. The boy is the man in germ. Theodore was rough and ungainly as a bear in his school-day sports, awkward in behavior, bashful in the presence of strangers, was dreaded on account of his powers of mimicry; he was not beloved by his companions, yet he would not see any body abused. He was no bully. At eight he was one of the greatest readers in town,

had a prodigious memory, and began that course of verse-writing which proved so severe an affliction to his fond biographer. He had already read Rollin, Homer, and Plutarch, all the poetry he could lay hands on, and many odd volumes of history. He began to study Latin when ten years old, and at fifteen had mastered the usual elementary books, with Virgil, Cicero's Select Orations, and Sallust. He began Greek at eleven years, but does not record his progress. Natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry, and rhetoric, he studied by himself. In his seventeenth year he added algebra to Latin and Greek at the Lexington Academy. Such was his equipment when he began to teach school at Quincy in the winter of 1827. It had been obtained through about three years of solid schooling and an indefinite amount of private study. His father was not able to purchase the books needed by the young scholar, and the latter levied on the whortleberry-bushes for the requisite funds. He taught every winter for four years; after Quincy came North Lexington, then Concord, and finally Waltham. His services on the farm were of no great value to his father during the winter months, and so he was free to teach. When he taught in other seasons of the year he hired a hand to take his place in the field. This was done three several times. At Waltham he began to teach French after taking a very few lessons himself, and afterward he applied himself to Spanish. When just twenty he went to Cambridge to be examined for admission to Harvard College. He was admitted and returned to inform his father. "But, Theodore, you know I cannot support you there!" was the response that greeted him. "I know that, father; I mean to stay at home and keep up with my class." He did so; but, being a non-resident and unable to pay the tuition fees, he was not entitled to the degree of "A.B." The degree of "A.M." was conferred upon him at Harvard in 1840, *honoris causa*.

On the 23d of March, 1831, he came to Boston in fulfillment of an engagement to assist in the instruction of a private school. He transported hither eleven octavo volumes, his entire library, and fell to work with indomitable resolution and energy. He had fifteen dollars a month and his board for teaching Latin, Greek, French, and Spanish, the mathematics, and all sorts of philosophy. He taught six hours a day, and from May to

September seven hours. He boarded in Blossom-street. He hired a man to do his work on the farm from March till August, when he became of age. Thus was he fairly launched on the busy tides of life. He tells Dr. Howe that he used to spend from ten to twelve hours each day in private studies. He also suffered from loneliness and want of affection. A beloved sister passed away, and none came to claim a tender place in his heart. He remained in Boston just one year—whether the engagement was closed on his motion or not we do not know. He next opened a private school in Watertown, where he found much to encourage him—pleasant social relations, the friendship of the Rev. Dr. Francis, the Unitarian clergyman there, and the promise of a wife in Miss Lydia D. Cabot.

There is some difficulty in finding out precisely what he achieved in this or at any subsequent stage of his progress. Had Mr. Weiss spared us eulogy and dissertation to give exact facts he would have laid us under a twofold obligation of gratitude. It is probable, however, that this vagueness of information is the fault of Mr. Parker himself. He had a trick of magnifying real facts with high-sounding phrases, and then drawing on his imagination to an unlimited extent for additional ones. If he has to say that his father was something of a mathematician, he states it thus: "He had studied algebra and geometry, was particularly fond of mathematics, and 'was great at figures.'" That he had a turn for metaphysics is told in these lofty but sphynx-like terms: "He liked metaphysics, psychology, and all departments of intellectual and moral philosophy, and he had read all the English books on philosophy." Here we obtain some notion of the father's attainments, but it would seem that he knew much more than it is at all probable he did. The last phrase undoubtedly tells us all that the father really knew, perhaps more. Of himself Theodore writes, "I read Homer and Plutarch before I was eight, Rollin's Ancient History about the same time, and *lots* of histories, with all the poetry I could find, before ten. I took to metaphysics about eleven or twelve." Weiss writes of him, "He pushed his way to Greece and Rome, and far outread the average for his years." He claims also that he never laid aside any book until he had studied and mastered it. Hardly a page would be required to say what books he

read and when he read them, at this date; such a statement would be of more worth to us than pages of empty declamation.

His college course would not close until the summer of 1834, yet he entered the junior class at the Divinity School in April of that year. Weiss implies on page 47 that his poverty was the sole reason of his not taking his degree, so that he must have completed the usual course of study. Indeed, Mr. Parker writes to Mr. Patterson that he had kept well ahead of his class in college. While this was going on he had also learned German and Hebrew, and meddled with Syriac. He also read "Greek and Latin literature, German metaphysics, as much political economy as he could find, mathematics, theology, and missal reading." Alas, that we knew just what he did read, and just how well he understood it! It seems unfair, after such vague talk from Mr. Parker, that Weiss should march him up and down on his own account before the well-filled shelves of Dr. Francis's library and trumpet out this unmeaning phrase: "Here, then, were *Dogmatik*, *Metaphysik*, and *Hermeneutik* for Theodore." And just as he left Watertown for the Divinity School, Weiss records that, "During the school-keeping he read Tacitus, Cicero, Herodotus, and Thucydides, and translated Pindar, Theocritus, Bion and Moschus, as well as Æschylus. He fell in with Cousin and the new school of French philosophers, and became acquainted with Coleridge. He also pursued the study of the literature of all the modern languages he then knew, (that is, French, Spanish, and German,) and made great strides in metaphysics and theology."

He entered the Theological School on the first day of April, 1834. He says that he had hesitated somewhat before taking this step. He had even made some preliminary studies looking toward the law as a profession. He was repelled by the doctrines which were taught in the pulpits, the notorious dullness of Sunday services, and the fact that the clergy did not lead in the intellectual, moral, or religious progress of the people. He says that Dr. Channing was the only man in the New England pulpit who seemed to him great. This account was written a little before his death. It is curious to compare all this with the references in his journal and letters to men like Francis, Norton, Palfrey, Stuart, Dewey, and Ware. It

is plain that in this account of his experience as a minister Parker continually substitutes his later conclusions for his early impressions. The account of the three questions which he asked and answered seems like an afterthought, stilted and artificial as the Masonic ritual. In certain cases we can detect great discrepancies between the statements contained in this document and the real facts. For example, among the "five distinct denials" of the popular theology with which he alleges that he entered upon his theological education, the first is "the ghastly doctrine of eternal damnation and a wrathful God." This he states that he made way with somewhere from his seventh to his tenth year. But he had forgotten the confession of his faith which he made in a letter to his nephew, Columbus Greene, on the second day of April, 1834. There he says, "I believe in a God . . . who will reward the good and punish the wicked, both in this life and the next. This punishment may be eternal."

The third "distinct denial" runs thus: "I had found no evidence which to me could authorize a belief in the supernatural birth of Jesus of Nazareth. The twofold biblical testimony was all; that was contradictory and good for nothing; we had not the affidavit of the mother, the only competent human witness, nor even the declaration of the Son; there was no circumstantial evidence to confirm the statement of the Gospels of a most improbable event."

In the letter to Greene he says, "I believe that Christ was the Son of God, conceived and born in a miraculous manner." Weiss also gives a quotation, on page 82, vol. i, of his Life, apparently from the Journal: "I do not doubt that Jesus was a man 'sent from God,' and endowed with power from on high, that he taught the truth and worked miracles." This was in 1835 or later. Indeed, he wavers a good deal on this head for some years more. In June, 1839, he speaks of Christ's miracle-working power as something natural to him and to the human race. Parker thinks he has himself felt something of it. He deems it not contrary to nature but above it. More than a year later he tells Miss Peabody, "I have no doubt that Jesus wrought miracles." It seems, then, that he had not even then gained the conception of God which "makes miracles as impossible as a round square."

The fourth "distinct denial" is thus stated: "Many miracles related in the Old and New Testaments seemed incredible to me; some were clearly impossible and others were wicked. Such, of course, I rejected at once, while I arbitrarily admitted others." Weiss quotes from him in 1835 or 1836 as follows: "Mr. Dewey gave us the Dudleyan lecture this year. It was the best, perhaps, that I have ever heard, though upon the least interesting part of the Evidences of Revealed Religion, namely, miracles. He removed the presumption against them—the objections were not only met but *overturned*." Dr. Dewey was hardly a leader in the New England pulpit, yet here is a note on him which shows whether Parker then thought Channing the only great man among the New England clergy, "Ah me! what an infinite distance between me and such men" as Dr. Dewey!

The fifth "distinct denial" is thus stated: "I had no belief in the plenary, infallible, verbal inspiration of the whole Bible, and strong doubts as to the *miraculous* inspiration of any part of it." Yet he tells Greene, "I believe the books of the Old and New Testaments to have been written by men inspired by God for certain purposes, but I do not think them inspired at all times."

These are very singular freaks for any man's memory to play, but they are still harder to account for in one who styles his a "memory that holds all things firm as gravitation, and yet, like that, keeps them unmixed, not confusing the most delicate outline, and reproduces them at will, complete in the whole and perfect in each part." The truth is, that the so-called Experience of Theodore Parker as a Minister is almost entirely untrustworthy when not corroborated by independent testimony. It seems rather his experience as it should have been than his experience as it really was. So grave an assertion would not be made if confirmation were not at hand. We have just seen that in his twenty-fourth year Parker still believed in the punishment of sin in the future world, and that he thought such punishments might be eternal. The letter to Greene goes back to the very time of his admission into the Cambridge Divinity School. In several places Mr. Parker has described a crisis of his early religious life in regard to the doctrine of future and endless punishment. This is its form in

one of his sermons: "I once knew a boy of early development in religion, dry-nursed at school, against his father's command, on the New England Primer, and he was filled with ghastly fear of the God represented in that Primer, and the hell thereof and the devil therein, and he used to sob himself to sleep with the prayer, 'O God! I beg that I may not be damned,' until at last, before he was eight years old, driven to desperation by that fear, he made way with that Primer, and with its grim God, and hell, and devil, and found rest for his soul in the spontaneous teachings of the religious sentiment that sprang up in his breast." Of course this has an autobiographic air; yet there are some strange facts to be connected with the account. In his Experience he affirms that he had such an early struggle over the dogma of endless retribution, and adds, "From my seventh year I had *no fear* of God, only an ever-greatening love and trust." The crisis described, then, occurred before his eighth year. Now it is singular that in his autobiography, which comes down to his eighth year, no mention is made of this fact. He discusses his early moral development then, and yet omits this event, one of its most striking features. How could he have attended Dr. Beecher's ministry for a whole year, and gone through one of his revivals, when teaching in Boston in 1831, after he had passed through such a crisis? It might be supposed that Dr. Beecher had disturbed his complacent rejection of this awful dogma, did not Parker expressly say the opposite: "I went through one of his 'protracted meetings,' listening to the fiery words of excited men, and hearing the most frightful doctrines set forth in sermon, song, and prayer. . . . But I came away with no confidence in his theology. The better I understood it, the more self-contradictory, unnatural, and hateful did it seem. A year of his preaching about finished all the respect I had for the Calvinistic scheme of theology." Assuming the truth of this account, how came he to write, two years after he had ceased to hear Beecher, that he still believed in the dogma of future punishment, and that he thought it might be eternal? So far as I can find, Parker first made the record of this painful struggle in 1839, when he surely had rejected the dogma of eternal retribution; it next appears in a sermon published in 1853, was next alluded to as a fact of his own history

in a letter to Mr. Senkler, and finally reaffirmed in his letter from Santa Cruz. If a fourfold averment of any fact has any worth, Mr. Parker is pledged for the veracity of his recital; if a forgotten letter can convict its writer of mistake, the letter to Mr. Greene performs that service for Parker. There could have been no motive for misstatement when the letter was written; but the account of the "crisis" was employed as an argument against a doctrine he hated. It seems like an invention. Such sobbings of fear, followed by such joyful confidence in the falsity of the rejected doctrines, are hardly a consistent prelude to what is contained in the letter to Greene.

At the theological school Parker made a marked impression. He was full of odd information, and crammed with facts picked up from books and observation. He was grotesque and frolicsome; was given to anger somewhat, but more to despondency. He was obliged to resolve to restrain licentiousness of imagination, which contains many things not to be committed to paper, lest the paper blush. Alas, Mr. Weiss, that he had "no sins to speak of!" He prayed with pious feeling, and talked about answers to his prayers. He wrote very poor sermons, and Professor Ware's frank criticisms of them reduced him to despair. But he excelled in debate, and loved it with the zest of a born disputant. In discussion he used to call Paul the apostle, "Old Paul;" and, when checked for his irreverence, mended the matter by substituting the words, "The gentleman from Tarsus."

He obtained the reputation of being a prodigious student. Some of his classmates asserted that he studied fourteen hours a day. He speaks of studying from ten to twelve hours a day when he was teaching six or seven hours. At West Roxbury, he says he found it a pleasure to work from ten to fifteen hours in his study. James Freeman Clarke, who had some chance to know, tells us that he wrought from six to twelve hours daily; and a writer in the "Atlantic Monthly" declares that he has Parker's word that he used to toil from twelve to seventeen hours daily among his books. We leave Mr. Weiss to settle these discrepancies. The account of his doings at the seminary is interesting. He resolved to "sleep six hours at least, seven certainly, and eight very often, to avoid excess in food and drink, and to spend three hours daily in the open air."

Weiss infers that he usually obtained less than six hours' sleep, though there is no ground, save Weiss's pleasure, for thinking so. The school exercises required eleven hours of his time per week. He sometimes taught private pupils as many hours more in the week.

Now let us see what he did while in the school. He read the Fathers, and made careful notes and analyses of their works. The Fathers of the Church, prior to the Council of Nice, make up eighteen goodly volumes, as published by T. & T. Clark. But there are manifest signs that he read some of the Post-Nicene Fathers. The Catholic and High-Church parties usually embrace the Christian writers of the first six centuries under this title. The Oxford edition consists of forty volumes. The vacation of 1834 was wholly spent in translating papers on La Fayette for Mr. Sparks. Here were two months gone. He spent a month of his last term on a visit to Washington. The poetic faculty kept up its proclamation of utter imaginative bankruptcy in legions of dreary verses. He translated, dipped into rabbinical matters, read books on the Messianic prophecies, and was favorably inclined to De Wette's views on this subject. He also asked himself some questions concerning the miraculous conception. He studied books on the Canon and the different versions of the Bible, translated the article on Rationalism from the Conversations-Lexicon, and also considerable matter from Eichhorn's *Ur-Geschichte*. Paulus succeeded, and a paper was written called Hints on German Theology. Next he went through the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," and began to read Spinoza. Under the caption, Horæ Platonicæ, analyses and criticisms on views contained in Plato's works are given. Sundays he used to walk to Charlestown to teach a Sunday-school class in the State-prison. Notes on Coleridge's Table-Talk follow. He read Wegscheider, Staudlin, Storr, Schmidt, Cudworth, Henry More, Norris, Descartes, Lessing, Cousin, B. Constant, Leibnitz, and, finally, the words, "books on magic, in which he was very curious," suggest numberless muddy tomes. He read Vico's Scienza Nuova, studied Ammon's "Fortbildung," and some Greek comedies, German commentaries, some volumes of De Wette, Kant, and a great many books on Gnosticism. The last was the subject of his graduating essay. He spent much of his time after the

middle of 1835 in writing for and editing "The Scriptural Investigator," a periodical published by students of the Divinity School. His contributions to this magazine number forty. The most important was an essay on the Laws of Moses, very highly commended by Mr. Weiss, but not read by the present writer. This paper extended through several numbers. Here he also published a translation of Astruc's Conjectures on Genesis, though not without fears that it would cause some outcry. Eight of the fourteen months in which Parker read three hundred and twenty volumes belong to this period.

Besides this account, based upon manuscript documents, we find another equally curious from Parker's pen in the Experience as a Minister. He says that during the three years preceding his settlement at West Roxbury he "read the Bible critically in the original tongues, and the most important parts of it also in the early versions." "I studied the historical development of religion among nations not Christian or Jewish, and attended as well as I then could to the four other great religious sects: the Brahmanic, Buddhistic, the Classic, and the Mohammedan. As far as possible at that time I studied the sacred books of mankind in their original tongues, and with the help of the most faithful interpreters. Here the Greek and Roman poets and philosophers came in for their place, there being no sacred books of the Classic nations. I attended pretty carefully to the religion of savages and barbarians. . . . I found no tribe of men destitute of religion who had attained power of articulate speech." He also names Locke, Hobbes, Berkeley, Hume, Paley, the French Materialists, Reid, Stewart, Butler, and Barrow, as giving him little help in his effort "to make an analysis of humanity, to see if I could detect the special element that produced religious consciousness in me, and religious phenomena in mankind." Kant aided him most, but, poor fellow! "he did not always furnish conclusions I could rest in; . . . yet gave me the true method, and put me on the right road." With much reading and protracted meditation, then, he found certain great primal intuitions of human nature, of which he gives us the three most important to religion:

"1. The instinctive intuition of the divine; the consciousness that there is a God.

"2. The instinctive intuition of the just and right; a consciousness that there is a moral law, independent of our will, which we ought to keep.

"3. The instinctive intuition of the immortal; the consciousness of eternal life.

"I thought it a triumph that I had . . . devised a scheme which to the scholar's mind, I thought, would legitimate what was spontaneously given to all by the great primal instincts of mankind. Then I proceeded to develop the contents of these instinctive intuitions of the divine, the just and the immortal, and see what God actually is, what morality is, and what eternal life has to offer. First, from the history of mankind, savage, barbarous, civilized, and enlightened, I gathered the most significant facts I could find relating to men's opinions about God, morality, heaven, and hell, and thence made such generalizations as the facts would warrant, which, however, were seldom satisfactory. . . .

"Next, from the primitive facts of consciousness, as given by the power of instinctive intuition, I endeavored to deduce the true notion of God, justice, and futurity. Here I could draw on human nature, and not be hindered by the limitations of human history. I studied books on sleep-walking, dreams, visions, prophecies, second-sight, oracles, ecstasies, witchcraft, magic wonders, the appearance of devils, ghosts, and the like; also the Pseudepigraphy of the Old Testament and the apocraphy of the New, with the strange fantasies of the Neplatonists. . . . I did not neglect the Mystics."

We shall presently show that this work, if done at all before his first settlement, must have been done ere Parker left the Theological School. I might fairly pause here to ask if there can be time to do more work than this in the twenty-four months spent by Parker in theological study at the school? Those months are—seven hundred and twenty days. Suppose Parker studied fourteen hours per day, we have ten thousand two hundred and twenty hours. Let any man, the abler the better, consider whether as much work has not been assigned to this space of time as can be well performed in it. I have taken no notice of the fact that his plan of study provides for only eleven to thirteen hours of daily study; nor have I made any allowance for Sunday, from a feeling that Parker made

none. In a letter to George Ripley, Parker says that he has not told all about the studies of this period, and Weiss throws out similar hints.

But there is more to come. Parker was a great linguist. Considering how much else he had done, we are somewhat surprised to find that on entering the Divinity School he claimed a good acquaintance with French, Spanish, German, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, and a "little Syriac." Eight languages, including his vernacular—no poor equipment for a young man of twenty-four. But in the school he made the most startling progress. Twelve languages were added to his store during the two years of his stay. Here is the list given by Weiss: Italian, Portuguese, Dutch, Icelandic, Chaldaic, Arabic, Persian, Coptic, Swedish, Danish, modern Greek, and Anglo-Saxon. Besides these he gets a smatter of Ethiopic, and attempts the Russian; the last was given up for want of somebody to teach him the sounds of the letters. This smatter of Ethiopic, shows what Mr. Parker thought of his attainments in the other languages of this list. It is a suspicious fact that Theodore came to Cambridge with a "little Syriac," but was soon so "nice" in his acquaintance with it as to be consulted by Professor Willard on certain difficult points. The truth is that accurate scholarship was not his gift. Mr. Senkler corrects his Greek. He boasted to Dr. Howe that he knew how to write French, Spanish, and German. We have been able to find no specimen of his German. When writing to German friends he sometimes drops in a German word with his English, but never ventures upon a full sentence. When he attempts an Italian phrase, a Spanish word drops in unperceived, and eludes the notice of his affectionate biographer. When he sprinkles his account of his broken umbrella on the route from Avignon to Arles, he says, "*Madame Fumeau* had *se mit sur la*, and it was *cassée;* therefore *voilà ma parapluie cassée.*" This can hardly be called a French sentence; for the *voilà*, in spite of the vigilance of Parker and his editor, has slipped off its proper accent, while the *se mit sur la* defies translation until M. Réville has corrected it for French readers. I know that these are small matters, but they are just such as Sainte Beuve brought against the Latin scholarship of Pontmartin, and of which he declared that they are decisive of the question of nice scholarship.

Indeed, it could not be otherwise. Mr. Parker read too much, his life through, to read well; he attempted too many languages to know any accurately. Mr. Weiss, however, writes that "all languages, dead and living, were mastered with great rapidity. . . . He learned not merely the vocabulary of a new tongue, as so many American students do, to get at the general sense of a book in the most economical manner, and push over the ground with smart conjectures, but he loved philology; the grammatical structure and derivation of a language attracted him first. The vocabulary came next."

This praise is lavished on a man who is said to have added to his stock of languages a fresh one every two months, at a time when he was surrounded with all sorts of work. If we are to believe this at all, we must believe it, with Tertullian, because it is impossible; and yet these incredible tales rest upon the testimony of Mr. Parker himself. In a letter to Miss Cabot he claims acquaintance with some twenty languages. I think this account must be taken with very large allowances for the temper which led to the assertion of his early rejection of the dogma of endless perdition.

To show that these studies must have been conducted, if at all, prior to his graduation in 1836, careful note will now be taken of his proceeding between that date and the next June, when he became pastor of West Roxbury. On August 6 we find him at Barnstable, where he remains four weeks, writes several sermons, and reads before half that time is gone about a dozen books; all he has with him, in fact. August 11, he begins to translate Dr. Wette's *Einleitung*. He reads Shelling's lectures on Academical Study, and finds them too ideal. In October he is preaching in Northfield, Mass., where he declines to settle. In November he preaches at Barnstable again, where he avoids a call. In December he supplies Dr. Flint's pulpit in Salem. He studies the English State Trials, and analyzes the great speeches contained in them. From these he learned method. He is in Northfield in January, 1837, candidates in Greenfield in February, preaches a good deal in Salem during the spring months, is married April 20, finishes his translation of De Wette May 20, is settled, June 23, at Spring-street, and has the revision of his translation of De Wette nearly completed July 13. The merest inspection

will show not only that his mode of life was unfavorable to study, but also that he had more than enough to busy his mind with.

There can be no doubt that the confusion which prevails in the accounts of his life at this period is mainly due to Parker's habit of exaggeration; but the evil is aggravated by the credulous temper of Mr. Weiss himself. Had he been careful to examine into the gross and palpable contradictions with which this part of his volume is crowded, we might have obtained some more consistent and probable record of these years. But when a biographer talks of a man of such manifold public labors as Parker was, as knowing "so well the contents of each volume of the twelve thousand" in his library, or tells us that "there was not a book in the whole vast collection which did not at some time serve his practical turn," what confidence can he expect? Read twelve thousand such volumes and die at forty-nine, after so active a life as Parker's became about 1846! What Bollandist was ever more credulous than Weiss? Here is the mythical tendency in strange company.

This exhibition of a disposition to exaggeration in Mr. Parker is not made for any purpose of depreciation. His life, career, and character cannot be understood unless we grasp this fundamental vice of his nature. Its influence we shall presently discern in many ways.

Parker was very far from having reached the conclusions he asserts he had gained before he settled in West Roxbury. It is refreshing to notice the modest tone of his letters, writings, and conversations as they appear in Weiss's account of that period, based on documents which date from it, as compared with the superior and triumphant air of the Experience. He talks with Norton, Stuart, and Channing without the least suspicion how much less is their intellectual stature than his. The lists of questions given by Weiss on pages 95 and 121 (the latter under the date of 1839) show that Mr. Parker was then groping dimly on his way to his ultimate position, but was far from having reached it.

After his ordination, June 23, 1837, life went on quietly enough with the young minister. He liked to write sermons, preach them, was one of the school committee, and grew

familiar with his audience of from seventy to one hundred and fifty persons. He presided over "Olympics" made up chiefly of lady friends, where Goethe, Bettini, Günderode, Norton, Fourier, Emerson, the Dial, and Parker's own verses, were discussed. Weiss, with his usual magnificent vagueness of phrase, adds to these themes "all cosmic questions." Parker reads Jacobi, old Henry More, Bulwer's Athens, The Life of Apollonius Tyaneus, studies ethics extensively, and begins to write for the periodicals. We have glimpses of him at a certain society of "Friends of Progress," where Hedge, Ripley, Wendell Phillips, Alcott, and Dr. Follen, are sometimes seen. He visits Norton, whom he still respects as learned and able, and their conversation is about Schleiermacher. We may guess how much he understands of German theology by the fact that he is quite unable to correct the Professor's false ideas of him. Moses Stuart surprises him with unexpected liberality of thought. Dr. Channing he considers the leader of the movement-party among the Unitarians. Parker had intended to become a reformer when he was settled in West Roxbury. This intention he keeps steadily in view. The beginning is made by venting his speculations in sermons to a congregation not sufficiently versed in theology to ask him any perplexing questions. "I preach abundant heresies, and they all go down, for the hearers don't know how heretical they are. I preach the worst of all things, transcendentalism itself, the grand heresy." This citation is the more important because it reveals the source of an influence very potent with him in these days. Mr. Emerson was as sphynx-like then as now, and many a hot dispute raged over his alleged Pantheism. Indeed, the air was rife with new notions; even Parker was shocked to hear Alcott talking about "the progress of God." But Emerson's notions about the self-sufficing nature of the soul began to affect his thoughts. This appears in his suspicion that he had been too great an admirer of Dr. Channing. It also crops out in his conversations with the latter. He is already breaking away from Channing's influence. Though he discusses with him the views of Strauss and other theological novelties, and finds him inclined to loose notions about the Sabbath, whenever a difference of opinion arises Channing appears a conservative and Parker a radical. When the former commends Parker's arti-

cle in the "Christian Examiner" on Ackerman's book, *Das Christliche im Plato*, he suggests the query whether it does justice to Christian morality as an advance on all other systems. When Channing says conscience needs to be educated, Parker laughs at the idea as absurd; when Channing, evidently thinking of the Bible, says we need an infallible guide, Parker responds that the conscience, or rather the soul, is one. Channing advises Parker not to translate Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, in a way that evidences a doubt lest he might be tempted to do it. While Parker, under the lead of Strauss, is learning to think of Jesus as a simple man, Channing holds that he had a miraculous character different in kind from ours. While Parker is sure that the writers of the New Testament had no inspiration different in kind from that of all good men, and that Jesus Christ only had more of the same kind that Socrates had, Channing believes that the Saviour had a revelation such as was enjoyed by none else save the old prophets. The tendency of Parker's mind is wholly in this direction. In 1837 he has read Strauss, and says, as he had lately been wont to, that the Old Testament miracles are absurd; but he now adds, for the first time, that the New Testament miracles, as prophecies, dreams, and miraculous births, are no less so. He admits a mythical element in the New Testament, though rather in the sense of Gobler and Bauer than that of Strauss. In 1838 he deems the scourge of small cords, the fish with the tribute-money, the cursing of the fig-tree, and the stories of the ascension pure fables; he also thinks Jesus or his disciples mistaken about the approaching end of the world. The same line of thought was powerfully stimulated by hearing Emerson's address in 1839 before the Divinity School. This memorable event is worthy of having all the light we can command thrown upon it. Under date of July 15, 1839, Parker writes: "I proceeded to Cambridge to hear Mr. Emerson's valedictory sermon. My soul is roused, and this week I shall write the long-meditated sermons on the state of the Church and the duties of these times." From this time the influence of Channing with him sensibly waned, and that of Emerson grew silently to vast power. Signs of an approaching conflict begin to show themselves. Parker's article in the "Boston Quarterly Review" on Palfrey's Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and

Antiquities, was of such a temper that people said his motive was blasphemous, and the best informed thought it the work of an atheist.

January, 1840, he preached the Thursday lecture on Inspiration. This was a delicate theme, and was handled without ceremony by Mr. Parker, now well on his way to that lord-of-all-I-survey style of treatment which grew so conspicuous in him toward the meridian of his career. His views had become such as to lead him to talk about the folly of thinking that the divine goodness had exhausted itself, and the probability that new Christs would be manifested among mankind. His spirit was deemed sarcastic and unchristian, which charge he ever denied with indignation. Yet he says that his own hair stood on end at the thought of what he had written. It was about the same period that a warm-hearted and clear-headed woman pronounced him a downright infidel. The question was also raised whether it was right to allow Emerson the name of Christian in view of his peculiar dogmatic utterances. Parker said "yes;" but Parker knew that he was in like condemnation. He began to assert that we might equal, or even transcend, Jesus Christ in spiritual insight and moral excellence, and he sought the most offensive way of saying so by bidding harlots strive after a perfection which should far surpass that of our Saviour. Of course it was logical and natural enough for him on such principles to say that one might shed a tear over the weakness of Jesus, and to affirm that John Augustus, a distant relative of his, had shown a greater love for the poor and vicious than Jesus of Nazareth, if the records of the evangelists are to be trusted. He attended the Chardon-street Convention, held in November, 1840. This meeting was called to discuss the ministry, the Sabbath, and the Church. Men of all shades of opinion were invited, under the management of Edmund Quincy, to share in the deliberations. Parker was advised by Channing to keep clear of the affair, but was bent on going. Of course the convention was a motley throng, and the extremists took virtual possession of the meeting. No candid and thoughtful believer had much chance of a hearing, and a disreputable fame hangs over the convention. Parker seems to have taken no active part in their discussions; but a record in his journal shows that he

meant to push his peculiar notions: "I have my own doctrines and shall support them, think the convention as it may."

The method of his reform was already growing clear to his own mind. He had begun by setting the soul above the Church and the Bible, and he must bring all things into harmony with such a position. The authority of the sacred Scriptures seemed a great obstacle to the success of these new views. Yet these views were working in him with the violence of new wine. He takes a lingering view of certain Christian dogmas which find powerful demonstration in the facts of human nature and history. The problem of evil must be confronted, and it seemed unlikely to favor his new ideas. The various diseases, deformities, and monstrosities which are presented in the animal world, the malignant aspect of a great part of the activity of men and beasts, and the terribly significant fact of death, all startle his mind. The apparent viciousness of brutes and the real viciousness of men are sad puzzles to him. If the simple truth must be told, Parker carefully evaded a thorough treatment of this question. He had declared it as his intention to clear theology of mythology and then apply good sense to it, so as to obtain a system which should be founded on facts of necessity, facts of consciousness, and facts of observation. We have a chance to see how he did this in relation to the fact of moral evil. He believed in a perfectly powerful, just, and good God. This knowledge he deemed intuitive and absolutely certain, and hence God can only create a world or universe that shall express and illustrate these qualities. But here is the actual world so full of seeming contradictions of these qualities that it appears an express refutation of these singular statements. But Parker is not daunted by such trifles. He concludes from his conception of God that the world *must be* perfect; that physical evils must be helps to our progress, errors the shortest and surest cuts to truth, and a proper and rapid experience in sin the sure mark of moral progress and growing purity. It is true, he modestly concedes that it is somewhat difficult to legitimate all this in the court of the understanding, indeed it may be found impossible; still he is sure of its truth. He tells us about the same period, "I think sin leaves little mark on the soul; for, first, much of it is to be referred to causes that are external even to

the physical man; and, second, much to the man's organism. I think ninety-nine hundredths of all sins thus explicable." The winter before he died he wrote from Rome a letter to the Rev. James Freeman Clarke which shows that he had long ere that time ceased to treat this gravest of moral questions seriously. "Sin," he says, "commonly called ngsinn-n-n, has no existence." With him, as with Plato, it is of the nature of error. He makes his way to such a startling conclusion the easier by endeavoring to persuade himself that human freedom, if it exist at all in moral conduct, has a very narrow range, and that abnormal moral conduct is as sure to be brought back to righteousness as the stones we cast at the sky are of being pulled down by gravitation. Of course such ideas cut him off from any serious condemnation of sin in others. They led him to say that the harlot who plied her infamous trade in the nearest bagnio was perhaps better in the sight of God than himself, made him transport men like Webster and Choate, after pronouncing the severest judgment on their morals and political courses, at once to the heaven of eternal love. They would have softened, and in many instances did soften, his denunciations of the rumseller, the slave-trader, slaveholder, slave-commissioner, or doughface politician. In all consistency he ought to have said to himself, Such men are not very bad, after all; their faults are the results of their circumstances; they are rather to be pitied than blamed. He often did talk thus; but when he was confronted with such a sinner he seemed a living fury of vengeance. He was nobly inconsistent with his own creed, and makes one think of Zeno, whose slave was being punished for theft: "Why whip me, since it was fated that I should steal?" "Because it was also fated that you should be whipped."

It is perfectly clear that Mr. Parker had got quite beyond the tenets of Unitarianism, and equally plain that he meant to make the new gospel ring in the ears of men. In 1840 he writes, "For my own part, I am determined in the coming year to let out all the force of transcendentalism that is in me. Come what will come, I will let off the truth as fast as it comes. . . . How my own thought troubles me! I have a work to do, and how am I straitened till it is accomplished! I must write an Introduction to the New Testament, showing

the distinctive and universal part of Christianity—a philosophy of man, showing the foundation for religion in him. Then the crown of theology, defining the relation of God and man. I must do or die." In this exalted mood he resolves to write immediately a sermon on Idolatry, and he minutes the points that he intends to discuss. These will help us to detect the drift of his meditations. After a few well-delivered blows at mammon and love of a good name, he uncovers the real objects of the discourse by saying that the Church makes an idol of the Bible; that it loves Jesus Christ as God though he is not God; that the Church, ministry, and Sabbath are regarded as divine institutions, though they are merely human. Weiss is right in saying that Parker planned his movements on such subjects with care and deliberation. He thought the hour had come for a revolution in theology, and he meant to have a conspicuous share in its accomplishment.

On the 19th of May, 1841, the Rev. C. C. Shackford was ordained pastor of the Hawes Place Church in South Boston. Mr. Parker had been invited to preach the ordination sermon. Though his sermon was poorly conceived, and not very well written, it was destined to become famous. Its subject is The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity. It was a new and not very vigorous statement of the points in which its author thought a reform in theology demanded. The words of Jesus, so far as they express truth, will not pass away, but the rites of Christianity may be changed; the false science which has been represented as a part of the truth contained in the Scriptures will be rejected; the popular theology will vanish; doctrines will change, for they have changed. Here are given as illustrations the common doctrines of the origin and authority of the Old and New Testaments. This idolatry of the Old Testament did not always exist, and modern criticism is destroying it. So of the New Testament, it must give way. The ordinary notions of inspiration have no basis in the Bible. Its modest authors would be confounded at our idolatry of them. So of the dogmas relating to the nature and authority of Christ. The sects base Christianity on the personal authority of Jesus, not on absolute truth. Why not the axioms of geometry on the authority of Euclid or Archimedes? Opinions on the nature of Christ are constantly changing, and so are not

fundamentally related to Christianity. In all the discourse Jesus is treated as a mere man; a lofty soul, indeed, inspired beyond all others of his time and of any time, faithful to himself and others, but nothing more. There was no marked stir during the delivery of the discourse, only the venerable clergyman who made the ordaining prayer besought the Throne of Grace that the young candidate might always have a living faith in a Son of God of divine nature and work. It seemed that the affair was to go by without any noise. It was a rash thing, to be sure, for the preacher to say openly in public, and perhaps before the evangelicals, what he might freely say in private to as many as he pleased. Entire mental and moral freedom was the Unitarian rule, and, provided it was prudently observed, no harm would be done.

But the terrible orthodox were there. The South Boston blasphemy was noised abroad. The press discussed it at length, and, delicate as was their position, the Unitarians would perhaps have borne with the rash offender but for the effect on the public. The orthodox had always said that such would be the end of the Unitarian heresy. They now congratulated themselves on their skill in prophecy. The lines were drawn at last so that every body could see whither Socinianism was leading public opinion. It was no longer possible to doubt that the issue would be Deism or Christianity. Parker was right in asserting that he was acting on principles acknowledged by all his party; yet he was unreasonable in supposing that all would see this. Many of them, doubtless, did not believe it. All felt the singularly awkward position his sermon put them in toward the orthodox. On the whole, the Unitarians behaved very badly. They had no right to ostracise Parker, to refuse him recognition on the street, to rise up from the sofa where he had taken a seat, nor to refuse his hand when offered in salutation. However, it is not safe to disturb the dignity of human nature even in dainty Unitarians, unless you are willing to risk an astonishing exhibition of human depravity. So Mr. Parker found to his cost. His connection with them could only be an embarrassment to them and a discomfort to himself; yet, on the pretext that the rights of free thought and free speech were involved in the question, he refused to withdraw from them, as they would gladly have seen him do. They

refused to expel him from their association, and thus afford him the attitude of persecution and the moral advantages which attend that sort of martyrdom. These he earnestly coveted; these they constantly refused to give him. You think yourselves aggrieved, he said; very well, the remedy is in your own hands—expel me. We are aggrieved, they said; but we cannot afford to confer on you in the public estimation the canonization of martyrdom. Both were wrong. Parker should have separated from their fellowship when he discovered that he had strayed beyond the limits of permissible heresy. They should have enforced upon him the natural consequences of the position which he had voluntarily assumed. But as neither party had the courage to accept the situation, the public witnessed the singular comedy of an ecclesiastical offender begging for ecclesiastical execution, and of an ecclesiastical inquisition persistently avoiding its office. It is curious to see how eager Parker and his friends were for some blunder on the part of his opponents which would relieve his position by awakening some sympathy for him in the public mind. Under date of June 13, 1841, the Rev. Dr. Francis writes, "I find there is a great hue and cry over Parker's sermon at the ordination of Mr. Shackford: he is accused of infidelity, etc.,—the old song over again,—and one writer in the 'Puritan' recommends that he be prosecuted under the laws of the Commonwealth against blasphemy! Bravo! So mote it be! Would to God they would try their hand at this!" etc. Alas, that a preacher of the dignity of human nature should stoop to write such lines!

Nobody would persecute him or prosecute him, so as to give him the airs of a martyr; but for ecclesiastical and civil ostracism social proscription was substituted. People ceased to know him, ministers refused to exchange with him; he found the journals shut against him, and an effort was made to reduce him to silence. Even Dr. Francis canceled a contemplated exchange. A few stood by him with courage. His bearing under all this evil treatment was not very noble. He whined, complained that some who secretly thought as he did held a different language in public. No doubt there was some ground for all this, but he should have expected it and been prepared for it. But he was evidently taken by surprise that,

instead of heading the Unitarian advance, he had been rudely thrust over among the devil's own. There was then, as ever, something weak and sickly in his temper; as Bartol says, "he had the disease of a sore personality." As I have read and weighed his own references to this event in letters and pamphlets, the conviction has steadily grown upon me that Parker had not the inward support required to maintain an unruffled temper under such severe trials. When John Wesley had passed through the great spiritual struggles which ended in that settled and unbroken serenity which marked his life from its thirty-fifth year to the close, he, too, soon found the pulpits of his Church closed against him. He believed that he was only renewing the pure doctrines of the earlier and better days of the English Church, and reviving the decayed piety of a fallen generation. He did not say that unless he could obtain a hearing elsewhere he would scour the land on preaching tours, but instantly and without a murmur fled to the highways, the hillsides, and the moors, to proclaim his joyful faith. At length Wesley came to Oxford to officiate in his turn before the University. It was the season of the races, and many strangers were in town. Such was the state of public opinion that clergymen, gownsmen, and learned professors joined with sportsmen and the rabble in the excitements of the turf. The fame of the great field-preacher had awakened a widespread desire to hear him. At Christ Church Charles Wesley found men in surplices at morning prayers talking, laughing, and pointing as if at a play; but at St. Mary's, where John preached, the scene was very different. The assembly was very large, and the services solemn. The sermon was an earnest plea for spiritual life and practical holiness after the model of the New Testament. It was as novel language to that careless generation as Mr. Parker's was to any of his South Boston hearers. Every word was carefully heard. Wesley thought he should not be permitted to speak there again, and made the most of the occasion. The Vice-Chancellor sent a message after him and desired his notes. They were sealed up and delivered to him. In his journal Wesley writes, "I preached, I suppose, for the last time at St. Mary's. Be it so. I am clear of the blood of these men. I have fully delivered my own soul." He remembers that it is St. Bartholomew's day,

and is glad that this event has befallen him on the very day on which, in the preceding century, near two thousand burning and shining lights were quenched. He meditates: "What a difference between their case and mine. They were turned out of house and home and all they had, whereas I am only hindered from preaching, without any other loss, and in a kind of honorable manner, it being determined that when my next turn to preach comes they will pay a person to preach for me." How serene and manly, not to say pious, is this temper! And yet the offense against Mr. Wesley was of precisely the same nature as that over which Parker whimpered, cried, and broke off old friendships, while the offense of the former was infinitely less.

Parker returned to his little parish at West Roxbury, where, however the storm might rage elsewhere, he always found peace. It speaks well for him that all attempts to alienate the affections of his parishioners failed. They were his firm and constant friends. In this quiet abode he continued to study, read, think, and find domestic happiness; yet his eye watched the movement of the storm he had raised, and ever and anon he intervened in the conflict. He was evidently resolved to secure a hearing and compel a careful attention to his views. He begins to suspect that to continue in West Roxbury will be virtually to be buried alive. He keeps an open eye for a better chance to make the world listen to him. Various schemes for the accomplishment of this plan occupied his thoughts. Here is one: "I will study seven or eight months in the year, and four or five months I will go about and preach and lecture in city and glen, wherever men and women can be found. I will go eastward and westward, northward and southward, and make the land *ring;* and if this New England theology that cramps the intellect and cramps the soul of us does not come to the ground, then it shall be because it has more truth in it than I have ever found."

Obviously a man of this temper would have a hearing in some form. Early in May, 1842, he sent the last sheet of his Discourse of Religion to the printer, and in somewhat more than a twelvemonth later his translation of De Wette's Introduction followed. As he found himself very much exhausted with these and other labors, he resolved on a year's travel in Europe. Mr. Russell, one of his parishioners, furnished the needful

funds, and accordingly he sailed from New York on the 9th of September, 1843. Before we follow him on his journey let us consider the Discourse of Religion and some other subsidiary matters.

When Weiss comes to speak of this book in his Life of Parker he ascends at once to that region of lofty phrases which is so natural with him. He asserts that people had their doubts in regard to the reality of the research and learning implied in the foot-notes: "It led them to suspect an illusion. Had all these leading books in all languages been faithfully read and assimilated? . . . Though they could not undertake to read Mr. Parker's authorities to trace the monstrous plagiarisms, the fact was assumed by every subservient mind," etc. In this Discourse, as printed in Miss Cobbe's edition of Parker's Works, I count four hundred and four different authors cited in the foot-notes. I have never seen the first edition, but it is clear, from what Parker says, that not many citations were added to the subsequent editions. Twenty-nine of these authors Parker is recorded by Weiss to have read before this book was published. It would surely have been possible for Mr. Parker to have read the Latin, French, and German books which he cites in his foot-notes after his settlement at Spring-street. Weiss quotes also one Italian work, Vico's Scienza Nuova. Three or four languages are no marvelous achievement; and merely to read books without digesting their contents is as possible as it is unprofitable. But if Mr. Weiss means that Parker had read and assimilated all these books, it would not be difficult to show the assertion false. It is only needful to examine the list of works cited to see the impossibility of the thing. Parker says in his Experience as a Minister that he used to work from ten to fifteen hours daily in literary tasks—twelve to seventeen is the statement which he made to a friend—but in a letter to Mr. Isaac Parker, written while he was still in West Roxbury, he tells him that he can obtain ten hours five days in the week for literary labors. The last statement is obviously the one most deserving of credit because it dates back to the period in question. At this rate the works cited would require Mr. Parker to read one volume every thirty working hours between his settlement and the publication of his book. This allows no time for letters, visits,

journeys, newspapers, reviews, for the thirteen elaborate articles which he wrote for the periodicals, for reading history, poetry, and other books into which he sometimes plunged, for Olympics, and verse writing and for private meditation in his reading and studies. The present writer has examined many of the works mentioned, has read many in all the languages to which they belong; they are mostly solid books, and they could not be read *and* digested in that time. Besides, the translation of De Wette was not finished July 13, 1837, and Parker tells us that the translation was the least of his labors in preparing that work for the press. On page 402, vol. i, of Weiss's Life, Parker tells George Ripley how he prepared this translation: "1. I read the original carefully, studied it (beginning in 1836) and the new editions as they successively appeared till 1843. 2. I translated word for word. 3. I read: (*a*) All the previous introductions of the Old Testament from Simon down to Hengstenberg. That was a labor. (*b*) All the Christian writers (Fathers, etc.) who treated of such matters down to Jerome and Augustine; that also took *some* time. (*c*) I read all modern works relating thereto; often a weariness. (*d*) I added from those what I thought necessary. . . . I popularized thus: (*a*) I translated all the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew (Rabbinical) passages which De Wette left untranslated, and I put the original extracts into the margin. It was a pretty piece of work, as you may guess, to do into English the awful Latin and Greek of the old choughs who wrote so barbarously. I looked over the references to the Bible." That this work was done during the time which preceded the appearance of the Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion, appears from a letter to Mr. Smith, under date of October 10, where he says that De Wette is in press, and that three hundred pages are stereotyped. He complains of having been ill all the summer, so that he could do almost nothing. Now it is remarkable that most of this work had no special relation to the Discourse. Here again we have the twenty-tongued boaster. Mr. Weiss is right in his supposition that Parker meant to have it understood that he had read the works he cites; such is the natural impression which the reader takes; and this impression is confirmed by the fact that Mr. Parker now and then tells us that such or such a book he has not seen

or read. This is the very youth who gets through all human history at the Divinity School, finds his investigations *hampered* by the *limits* of history, learns twelve languages thoroughly in two years, makes a mouthful of the course of study which was a three years' task for his class, and read meantime a list of books whose figure, as Réville says, really frightens us.

Mr. Parker's opponents "could not undertake to read his authorities!" Is skepticism, then, the indispensable qualification for scholarship? Shades of Stuart, Alexander, Norton, and Noyes, blush for your inferiority to this stripling! Before leaving this part of the subject we ought to note the influence of Parker in the direction of boastfulness. He had none of that literary modesty which prompted Lessing to write, "I would not seem to have read any book which I have not read." He never belonged to that University of which Liddon speaks, where it is a point of honor always to state things so that facts will more than justify the statement. To obtain credit for scholarship which we do not possess is literary dishonesty, and of this Parker was full. He seems to infect all who came in contact with him with the same spirit; for Mr. Weiss is by no means his sole victim. A curious illustration offers itself from the other side of the Atlantic. While writing these pages I have sought diversion rather than instruction in looking over a French book entitled Theodore Parker. It is from the pen of M. A. Réville, a distinguished Rationalist clergyman and biblical critic. I have found both instruction and amusement in its pages. Réville cites Weiss as his main authority for the account he gives of Parker. Weiss says that Parker's grandfather carried a light fowling-piece at the capture of Quebec; Réville says he "distinguished himself" there. Weiss says that he "was not engaged," though present, at the battle of Bunker Hill; Réville says he displayed a "veritable heroism" in that fight. Weiss says that when Theodore told his father that he had entered Harvard College he allayed the old gentleman's alarm at the probable expenses by telling him, "I mean to stay at home and keep up with my class;" Réville has it, "I intend to provide for my support by giving lessons or opening a school." Weiss confesses that Parker turned a little colored girl from his school in Watertown solely because certain patrons of the school demanded the act, and only defends him by

saying: "This he always confessed with mortification;" Réville expounds the line of defense thus: "But the very existence of his school, as yet hardly founded, and all his hopes, were at stake." Mr. Weiss says nothing about the personal attractions of Miss Cabot; but Réville, remembering that none but the brave deserve the fair, tell us that she "was a charming maiden, of remarkable beauty, and a teacher in the little town." Weiss calls the statement of belief in Parker's letter to Columbus Greene purely conventional; Réville glosses as follows: "In this confession of faith, evidently inspired by the fear of shocking a soul by clashing too roughly with its belief, Parker intends by the possibility of eternal punishment, that which would result from a voluntary and eternal persistance in sin." But Weiss should have taught him better. Weiss surely says quite enough about what Parker did in the Divinity School, but he furnishes no ground for Réville's assertion, that "after a few months there he had surpassed most of his professors themselves." Réville closes a long account of the persecutions Parker underwent for his ideas with the incomprehensible statement that "the Boston Academy did not dare to open its doors to him, where, without controversy, he would have occupied one of the chief places." Weiss gives no clue to this grief, and what it is I am at a loss to guess. Réville says that Parker's congregation numbered from seven thousand to eight thousand souls; Weiss, that it sometimes reached three thousand. Finally, Réville gives this original bit of information: Thanksgiving Day, "an annual service commemorative of the Declaration of Independence." I was always surprised at the exact and extensive knowledge of rationalistic critics. This is by no means the only discovery of that sort which has enlivened the dreary labor of this investigation.

But it is time to look at the contents of the Discourse of Religion. It is evidently an effort on the part of its author to clear what he conceives to be religion from entangling alliances. It is a vigorous rejection of the authority of the evangelical faith. The peculiar dogma of the book is the sufficiency of human nature for all its functions. Man's religion is a joint development from the nature within him and the outward world. God, duty, and immortality are conceptions which arise of themselves in human souls. Out of these fun-

damental ideas all religious systems have been builded up. These three great primary and intuitional truths of religion Parker claims, in the Experience as a Minister, to have reached before his settlement at West Roxbury. Yet it is remarkable that the intuition of moral law, and human duty under it, makes almost no figure in this Discourse. The intuition of God and the intuition of immortality are rather mentioned than discussed, since, being intuitions of the reason, they depend not on reasons, but on reason itself.

I have as little time as my readers would have patience for any minute criticism of this work. After discussing and clearing the idea of God, Parker dwells on the power of the religious idea—traces the development of religion through Fetichism, Polytheism, up to Monotheism. Next he glances at the doctrines of the primitive state of man and the immortality of the soul. Then follow discourses on Inspiration, Christianity, the Bible, and the Church. It will be seen from this schedule that here was an admirable opportunity to declare his notions on all the points in discussion between his foes and himself. There is little wonder that the book awakened a storm among the more moderate and conservative Unitarians. The orthodox seem to have enjoyed the confusion of their heretical friends when they found a heretic on their own hands upon whom they felt obliged to shut the door. There was not only some ground for alarm in the doctrines of the work themselves, but this was aggravated by the tone and spirit of the author. Even toward those whom he deemed his friends he indulged his sarcastic vein. Miss Bremer gives a characteristic glimpse of him at one of Alcott's conversations. The talk that evening had been conducted by several parties, and had been as vague and unsatisfactory as possible. Parker recited in a quiet, effective, but covertly sarcastic manner, the substance of what had been said. Alcott especially was touched with sly ridicule. This stroke of Parker's was so keen that the entire company smiled as he concluded. But Emerson turned with an eagle glance and said, "That is all true, all perfectly correct, and it would be all entirely proper were this a debating club instead of a free conversation. But I am reminded of an inscription over the door of the room where an English acquaintance assembles his friends for free and easy talk. I

cannot give the words, but the point of it is that every body has the right to say what seems to him good on any subject, but that none has the right to criticise what is said." On this repartee the company laughed again, this time at Parker's expense. He seemed a little hurt, blushed, and blamed the vagueness of the conversation. This anecdote puts Parker before us in his natural attitude of sarcasm, and of vexation when his sarcasm was resented. When his sermon on The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity appeared, the general verdict was that its temper was harsh and sarcastic. Parker had already been forced to defend himself from the same charge in relation to his article on Palfrey's Lectures in a letter to his classmate, Mr. Silsbee. His friends, like Miss Healy and his own brother-in-law, warned him of this peril. On occasion of his letter to the Unitarian Association, Miss Peabody suggested the same fault in gracious terms. When the discourse appeared, Dr. Francis, a somewhat partial judge, while excusing Parker from any evil motives, writes as follows: "I find a great deal in Parker's book to regret. . . . The spirit of it *seems* to be bad, derisive, sarcastic, arrogant, contemptuous of what the wise and good hold sacred. Nothing of all this did he mean, I am persuaded. I wish very much that he had reserved the publication of it till years had brought more consideration."

Mr. Parker had a ready answer for all such suggestions, and that answer was a flat denial. Never did he write a word against man or maid in a sarcastic humor; indeed he dared not; it was quite against his principles to do so. We can hardly accept this defense as honest without a suspicion of some defect in the quality of his mind. He somewhere admits having said sharp things, but declares he does not think them sarcastic. He defines sarcasm as flaying alive and stripping the flesh off the bones. We shall perhaps have occasion to cite some of his gentle sayings, and then our readers can judge for themselves on this head.

Art. II.—THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE PEOPLE.

Luther's Sämmtliche Schriften, herausg. von Dr. Walch. 24 Vols. Halle. 1740.
Pressensé's Early Years of Christianity. The Apostolic Era. New York. 1870.
Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church during the First Three Centuries. New York. 1850.
M' Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia. Volume II. Art. Clergy.

St. Peter's words, "Ye are a royal priesthood," were, to the great Lutheran Reformers, infinitely more than a rhetorical phrase, or hyperbolic expression of the dignity of the common Christian life. Luther himself, in asserting that "the priesthood is common to all Christians," called this, and similar texts, "thunderbolts of God," against which, "neither all the Fathers, nor all the Councils, though they were innumerable; neither long continued usage, nor all the world combined, shall be able to prevail." They express one of the most effective ideas of the great Reformation, a characteristic idea of the primitive Church. They afford also, we think, the best solution of one of the greatest practical problems of modern Christianity. That problem is expressed to-day, throughout European and American Protestantism, by the question: How can the laity be brought into more effective co-operation with the ministry in the life and work of the Church? It has been discussed in sessions of the Evangelical Alliance; it was the chief thesis in a Convention, gathered from all parts of this country, not long since, in New York; and is an incessant topic in our religious journals. Nearly all evangelical denominations seem to be awaking to its urgency. In the New York Convention it assumed, perhaps, a somewhat "radical" form. Its supreme importance renders it desirable that it should be cautiously treated; but any just treatment of it, from the stand-point of the Reformers and of the Apostolic Church, will appear radical, if not heretical, to the confused vision of our times. We cannot fail, however, to perceive at a glance, that, if rightly developed, it may become an epochal idea of modern, as it was of ancient, Church history.

All earnest Christian minds vaguely recognize the true solution of the problem; but this vagueness, to a great degree, neutralizes its solution. General inculcations about the duty of "lay" devotion to Church interests will not suffice. Men of peculiar temperament, or special religious fervor, or ready utter-

ance in the social devotional assembly, or of other marked capacity for usefulness, may, here and there, be inspired by such vague appeals; but the Church, as a whole, will unconsciously evade them. We need more specific and positive teaching on the subject. The Apostolic and Lutheran doctrine of the "priesthood of the people" is the real dogmatic basis of the needed reform—the stand-point from which the responsibility of the laity should be asserted in our pulpits and religious journals. Thence alone can it take a readily cognizable and positive shape.

Our clergy need to study more the literature of the Reformation, to ascertain fully the importance of its teachings on this subject. The Reformation was projected on two great ideas—one theological, the other ecclesiastical. The former was Justification by Faith, the latter the Priesthood of the people. By the one it made the personal salvation of man dependent upon himself, striking away all supposed necessary dependence upon mystical, or rather magical, interventions of the clerical priesthood, and emancipating the individual conscience. By the other it struck, fatally, as we may still hope, the hierarchical ecclesiasticism by which Popery had bound down Europe for a thousand years.

Luther acknowledged the importance of the pastoral, or preaching, office; no man has more emphatically asserted its divine sanctions; but he insisted, in writing to the Senate of Prague, on the "institution of ministers," that the pastor is "one *who, in the place and in the name of all, who have the same right*, should perform the (sacred) offices, that there be not a base confusion among the people of God, and that a sort of a Babel be not made in the Church." In his "Articles of Schmalkald," written in expectation that they would be presented to a General Council, he affirms the same opinion. The Helvetic Confession, while asserting the importance of the ministry as a distinct function, declares that priesthood "is common to all Christians," though the ministerial function, of course, cannot expediently be so. "In the New Testament," it says, "there is no more such a priesthood as obtained among the ancient people of God, which has an outward anointing, and very many ceremonies, which were types of Christ, who, fulfilling them all, has abrogated all. He remains

the sole priest, and, lest we should derogate from him, we give the name of priest to no minister."

Popery saw the portentous significance of this great thesis of the Reformation; and the Council of Trent issued an article expressly against it, declaring that "if any one affirms that all Christians are, indiscriminately, priests of the New Testament, or that they are all mutually endowed with equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy," etc.

Such was the position the Continental Reformers assumed on this question. But we derive our Protestantism mostly through the English Reformation, and this, controlled by an unscrupulous monarch, and led by prelatical chiefs, never thoroughly did its work. The remnants of papal error have, down to our times, disfigured Anglican Protestantism, and are to-day distracting and disabling the National Church; while its Episcopal offshoots in this country (including Methodism) show, more or less, traces of its perverting traditions. In the late struggle for "Lay Representation" in the higher councils of American Methodism, the advocates of the innovation had continually to combat these traditions. A brief speech by one of them, arguing for it from the teachings of the Reformation regarding the priesthood of the people, was generally assailed in the journals of the Church as gravely heretical; and even now, after four or five years, it continues to be assailed in some quarters, though it assumed not one position which is not known to every student of the literature of the Reformation as fundamental in that greatest of ecclesiastical revolutions; not one which the most authoritative Continental scholars of Europe, in ecclesiastical history, do not admit to have been fundamental in the polity of the primitive Church.*

But the Reformation can be no authority for us, except so far as it accorded with primitive Christianity. What, then,

*For Luther's views of the subject see Walch's edition of his works, volume x, and particularly Gessert's *Evangelisches Pfarramt.* After reviewing the Scripture testimony on the subject, Luther says, as we have already partly cited, "Let this suffice, for these passages establish, in the clearest and most powerful manner, that the office of the word of God is the highest in the Church, and that it is one and common to all who are Christians, not only by right, but by command. The priesthood must, therefore, be no other than a single office, which is common to all Christians. And against these thunderbolts of God, neither all the fathers,

does this say on the subject? The only Scripture use of the word "priest" or "priesthood," as it respects Christianity, is in reference to the common priesthood of Christian men, and the "high priesthood" of Christ. Search through the New Testament, and you will find that all such passages substantially agree with Peter's declaration: "Ye," the laity, the common Church, "are a chosen generation;" as much so as was the priestly tribe of Levi, and more, for ye are "a royal priesthood," and therein "a peculiar people." And again: "Ye are . . . built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." St. John (Rev. i, 6) says: "Unto him who . . . both made us kings and priests unto God and his Father," etc., (v, 10; xx, 6.)

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is careful, respecting the high priesthood of Christ, to show that it is peculiar, is not according to the priesthood of Aaron or the Levites, but altogether unique—"after the order of Melchizedek." The old hierarchical system was now abolished, having answered its purpose as preliminary to Christianity. Christ having come, with him came the epoch of universal spiritual emancipation for the race. The rending of the temple's vail at his death had a sublime symbolical meaning. Hitherto the sacerdotal tribe could alone officiate in the temple—the highest priest could alone enter within the vail, the holiest of holies, and that but once a year; now had come the day of the universal ecclesiastical enfranchisement and the priestly consecration of all saints. The vail was "rent *from the top to the bottom;*" and now the apostle (Heb. x, 19) sublimely exhorts the Church, the "brethren," to "*have boldness to enter into the holiest,*" the unvailed, innermost place of the abolished priesthood.

Christianity knows no technical or clerical priesthood—none other than this common priestly function and dignity of all regenerated souls, under the sacerdotal headship of Christ. It has its ministry—its divinely-sanctioned administrators of instruction and discipline—but not a proper priesthood. It clothes all its true children with pontifical robes, and commands all of

nor all the councils, though they were innumerable, neither long-continued usage, nor all the world combined, shall ever be able to prevail." He proceeds to show, in detail, that all other clerical functions, such as the sacraments, etc., originally pertained to the people.

them, as a "royal priesthood," to live, work, and suffer for the common Church, "the kingdom of God" on earth.

The priestly and prelatical ideas which characterized mediæval Christianity, and still prevail so generally, sprung from early hierarchical tendencies in Church government. But what was the historical origin of the primitive Church government? what were the contemporary local facts bearing on the subject and illustrating its history? These should enable us to determine its significance.

The founders of Christianity were Jews; they saw the necessity of government in the incipient Church at Jerusalem, in a dispute about the distribution of alms, as narrated in the Acts of the Apostles; and they adopted in this exigency the usages to which they had been accustomed among their own countrymen; for these usages were simple, unpretentious, practically effective, and familiar to the people of the new communion. But let it be distinctly remarked that they did not go to the divinely-prescribed Levitical system for their Church order. They made no appeal to the writings of Moses, but to the Synagogue—to what may be called the provincial, the popular, religious usages of the Jews; the Synagogue order being not once mentioned in the writings of Moses, nor the Synagogue once alluded to by him, except so far as general admonitions to assemble for religious instruction can be construed as allusions to it. The Synagogue was founded in the local convenience of the people, as they found it to be expedient, after their settlement in Palestine. The Synagogues were chiefly provincial places of resort for the population on the Sabbath, when they could not go to the more or less distant metropolitan temple, the latter being peculiarly the seat of the national religion, the place of the official services of the priesthood. Some authorities suppose that they were first erected under the Maccabean princes, as there is nothing said of them in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Their services were characterized by much popular freedom. Their officers were not priests, but laymen. Though they had appointed readers of the law, yet the right of speaking or preaching in them was voluntary, and free to all whose intelligence and character befitted it. Christ sometimes taught in them. The apostles proclaimed the Gospel in them in the chief cities of the Roman empire.

Aged men were appointed councilors in the Synagogue, one of their number being its president or "ruler." They were called elders, or presbyters; for these, now technicalized and mystified words, originally signified simply *old men.* There was also the "servant" of the synagogue, called a deacon, who had charge of the charities of the assembly and distributed them to the poor, and did other minor services. Hence the appointment of deacons in the Church at Jerusalem, for a similar purpose, as recorded in the book of Acts. These men were set apart for their functions by "ordination," or "imposition of hands"—a rite which *was not used in the consecration of the regular priesthood*, (anointing being the rite for that,) but which was a common mode of designating the rabbinical and municipal functionaries of the country.

Here, then, in common customs of their nation, the first Christians found a convenient system of order for the new Church in its emergency at Jerusalem, whence the system proceeded out through Christendom—a system which, we repeat, had no direct connection with the temple or divinely-appointed service of the Jews, which originated in popular good sense and local expediency, and which had not a single explicit prescription in their sacred writings. The apostles in copying it exemplified it, and their example is worthy of imitation, but they nowhere enjoin it.

But what a stupendous system of ecclesiasticism—of prerogatives, dignities, offices, and mysteries—has been constructed on this primitive, simple scheme of expediency! In the larger communities, where there were several presbyters, one of them was chosen to preside over the rest; he thus became the "overseer," (for this is the original meaning of *episcopos*, bishop;) but this simple distinction of office was perverted into diocesan prelacy, and at last culminated in the patriarchates of the East and the papacy of the West. The merely expedient distinctions of presbyter and deacon became mysterious and essential differences, indispensable priestly "orders," without which there can be no valid Church, no efficacious sacraments. The ceremony of "ordination," "imposition of hands," (at first only an impressive form of designation to office,) became a "sacrament," a sort of magical rite, communicating and transmitting from age to age a divine virtue, and

giving origin to the fable of "apostolic succession," with all its priestly arrogations, exclusiveness, and uncharitableness. The sublime idea of the priesthood of the people was eclipsed throughout Christendom for more than ten centuries, and the Church became, almost universally, a huge mass of commingled ritualism, hierarchism, magical rites, and popular legends.

The whole hierarchical system of Christendom thus arose out of one of the most simple incidents of primitive Christian history: the imitation, at Jerusalem, of the order of the Jewish Synagogue by the Judaic Christians, an order which, though adopted, was, let us remember, never enjoined in the apostolic writings. Methodists, at least, believe with John Wesley that Scripture "prescribes no particular form of Church government;" that the only New Testament ordinance on the subject is, "Let all things be done decently and in order." And the view we take of the subject is thoroughly compatible with congregational decorum and public order. Luther, after showing that every right of the ministry is a common right of the laity, adds:

> Nevertheless, we have said this alone of the common rights and power of all Christians. For as all things are to be common to all Christians, as we have thus far explained and proved, it would be unbecoming for any one to push himself forward, appropriate to himself alone what belongs to us all, venture upon the use of this right, and, in case there be no one present who has also received such a right, exercise it in practice. But the right of the congregation demands this: that one, or as many as the congregation pleases, be elected and accepted, who shall, in the name of all the others, who have the same right, and in their stead, fill these offices publicly, so that there may not occur abominable disorders among the people of God, and the Church of Christ become a Babylon; but that all things shall take place in an orderly manner, as the apostle has taught. (1 Cor. xiv, 40.) This right is twofold: the one a common right exercised through the call of the congregation; the other that an individual in case of necessity use the same right. In a congregation where this right is free to all no one shall arrogate its exercise to himself without the will and call of the whole congregation. But, in cases of necessity, any one, yea, whosoever will, may avail himself of the same right.

No authority has uttered higher opinions of the divine sanction or the divine "call" of the ministry than Luther; but he found no difficulty in reconciling these with the priestly right

inherent in the congregation. Expediency was, with him, divine law, there being nothing expedient that is not right.*

Having thus reviewed the subject from the identical standpoint of the Reformation and the primitive Church, let us now consider some of the deductions which may be made from it:

First. We infer from it the essential equality of all saints, in the kingdom of God on earth. They are all a "royal priesthood"—all summoned to enter through the rent vail into the "holiest of holies," whither the supreme pontiff of the old dispensation could alone go. To eyes undimmed by the perverse traditions of the post-apostolic ages, the thoroughly democratic constitution of the primitive Church stands out a fact manifest and sublime. On the apostles, as the companions and personal witnesses of Christ, devolved the task of founding it by the general promulgation of his truth. They never pause to construct for it a formal polity; they adopt instead expedient measures, as these may be casually needed, and, having completed their mission, the apostolate expires, leaving the new-born communion free to grow by its own normal development according to the varied conditions of different lands and

* Students of Church polity, who may wish further critical verifications of the above views than are given in the authorities at the head of our article, may be referred to Vitringa's *De Synagoga Veteri;* Stillingfleet's *Irenicum;* Lord King's *Primitive Church;* Archbishop Whateley's *Kingdom of Christ.* Pressensé's recent volume on *The Apostolic Era* takes extreme but well-authenticated views of the priesthood and general powers of the people in the primitive Church. Published in this country by the Methodist Episcopal Church, it may be supposed to be thus tacitly indorsed by the denomination. The highest Methodist authorities on such questions (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia,* under the word "Clergy") giving substantially Neander's opinion, say: "In the Apostolical Church no abstract distinction of clergy and laity, as to privilege or sanctity, was known; all believers were called to the prophetic, kingly, and priestly offices in Christ. (1 Pet. v, 3.) The Jewish antithesis of clergy and laity was at first unknown among Christians, and it was only as men fell back from the evangelical to the Jewish point of view that the idea of the general Christian priesthood of all believers gave place, more or less completely, to that of the special priesthood or clergy. So Tertullian says, (*De Baptismo,* p. 17, before he became a Montanist:) 'The laity have also the right to administer the sacraments and to teach in the community.... If we look at the order necessary to be maintained in the Church, the laity are therefore to exercise their priestly right of administering the sacraments only when the time or circumstances require it.' From the time of Cyprian, (A. D. 258,) the father of the hierarchical system, the distinction of clergy and laity became prominent, and very soon was universally admitted. Indeed, from the third century onward the term *clerus* was almost exclusively applied to the ministry to distinguish it from the laity."

ages, guided by the divine truth and spirit with which it was endowed. We have seen how it borrowed its first simple regulations from the contemporary usages of the Jews. None of these marred its democratic simplicity. As a whole, a sanctified community, it was charged with its entire remaining mission. Its gifts were common. "The advocates of the hierarchy," says one of our best authorities, (Pressensé,) "do not deny that the miraculous gifts were bestowed on the Christians generally; but they assert, on behalf of the ecclesiastics, a monopoly of teaching. This distinction, however, is wholly arbitrary. The synagogue already acknowledged, under certain limitations, the right of every pious Jew to teach. It is not surprising that this right should be extended by St. Paul to all Christians, with the exception of women, who were to be silent in public worship. 'When ye come together,' he says, 'every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.' The right was long acknowledged in the Church. We read in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions, 'Let him who teacheth, if he be a layman, be versed in the word.' It remains an established fact that all believers had the right to teach in public worship. All alike took some share in the government of the community. They were summoned, on the occasion of the conferences at Jerusalem, to take a part in important deliberations. The letters of the apostles laid upon all the duty of caring for the great interests of the congregation. Discipline was an act of the community, not of the clergy. The sacraments were equally far from being a monopoly of the clergy. These principles were so deeply rooted in the Church that long after, at a time when it had undergone most important changes, they received striking testimony from the lips of St. Jerome. He says: 'The right of the laity to baptize has often been recognized in cases of necessity; for every one may give that which he has received.' We read in the 'Commentaries,' attributed to Ambrose, that 'in the beginning all taught and all baptized on every opportunity.'"

Such was the simple, practical freedom of original Christianity. Of course, the partial delegation of these rights and powers of the Church to selected men became necessary, at last, for its orderly procedure; but the inherent right of the

common priesthood remained. It could not be surrendered, for it was of divine ordination; so that, in the language of Luther, the designated preacher is but "one who in the place and in the name of all, who have the same right, should perform the sacred offices, that there be not confusion." Restricted only by the necessities of public order, the layman still maintained his priestly responsibility, and shared in every possible way the work and discipline of the society. Throughout the apostolic period this right was practical in the Church, and made it universally a body of working men and women, self-sacrificing in labor and heroic in suffering, until it overthrew the paganism of the classic world.

This doctrine does not detract from the "divine *call*" and dignity of the "ministry" proper. Yet it is precisely at this point that we need to clear up the whole subject to the people, by better discussion than it has usually received. We all admit the divine "call" of the pastorate, but in conceding it we have come, practically, to infer that no analogous vocation or responsibility belongs to the laity. The ministerial "call" is a conviction of the conscience, by the Holy Spirit, of the duty of preaching. But does not every real Christian have the Holy Spirit? Is not religion itself the indwelling of the Spirit—"the life of God in the soul of man?" And does not the indwelling Spirit "move" and aid every devout soul in matters of religious devotion and duty? Can, then, a rightly instructed layman, any more than a clergyman, evade, while under the influence of the Holy Spirit, any important occasion of duty without feeling the "woe" which Paul dreaded if he preached not the Gospel? And is not every opportunity of usefulness a *duty* to such a man? Let us not be misinterpreted here, for this point is vital. The work of the pastorate is the highest in the Church, and its call or responsibility is correspondent; but every saint—that is to say, every lay or "royal priest"—in the Church has the same Spirit, the same divine "moving," and help to duty, in his sphere and degree, and a proportionate "woe" if he neglect that duty. Each, as a member of the common priesthood, is to find out, by the light of the Spirit and the scrupulous consideration of his peculiar gifts or circumstances, in what particular way he is to discharge his part of the common service, the ministration

and propagation of the common cause: some to preach; some to "exhort;" some to teach; some to lead in the social devotions of the society; some to provide pecuniary supplies by their talents in business; but all to serve with equal consecration, moved, aided, and consoled by the same divine Spirit, in the one universal priesthood. The great error of Christendom is that the Church continues to allow an unscriptural discrimination here; that the vocation, or "moving," of the divine Spirit has been claimed by the clergy as a peculiar distinction of their function. This arrogation has been one of the most disastrous calamities in the history of the Church, for it has given rise to nearly all the usurpations and corruptions of the priestly class on the one side, and to the ecclesiastical enslavement and moral disablement of the laity on the other. It has practically identified the Church with the clergy.*

It is to be feared that in our own denomination this clerical arrogation (not to say arrogance) has grown rather than diminished. In certain quarters there has been no little disposition even to except ordained teachers from the ministry, and to consider clerical educators wrongly recognized in our Conferences. One of our journals says that "Prof. Wheeler was right when he surrendered his credentials, after having fully determined to devote himself to teaching." It speaks of clerical teachers, and other extra-pastoral functionaries, as practically belying the ministerial office, because they have nothing really to do with pastoral work. It seems to forget that even the apostles did little pastoral service, proper; that the original ministry is scripturally described as consisting of "some apostles, some prophets, and some evangelists, and *some pastors* and *teachers*, for the perfecting of the saints, for the *work* of the *ministry*." Now, though we need not insist that precisely this classification of ministerial laborers must be retained, intact, yet we do insist that it clearly shows the comprehensive and liberal scope of the ministerial organization. The apostolate necessarily died out with the apostles, and the form and

* "Arnold at a later day called him [Coleridge] the greatest intellect that England had produced within his memory, and learned, perhaps, from him some of his leading thoughts, as that the identification of the Church with the clergy was the 'first and fundamental apostasy.'"—Shairp's 'Studies in Poetry and Philosophy," p. 142. See Arnold's views, fully given in his Miscellaneous Works.

titles of some of the other offices gave way to modifications and new designations as the Church developed. Though no form of polity or Church organization is enjoined in the Holy Scriptures, yet two were exemplified: first, that above indicated by Paul; and, secondly, the later (yet partially contemporary) modifications, borrowed from the synagogue, and consisting of deacons, presbyters, and superintending presbyters or bishops. These latter, as we have seen, were a mere matter of practical convenience. Crystallizing at last into a permanent ministerial economy, they, like some natural crystalline forms, enlarged in the process till the hierarchical systems of the Greek and Latin ecclesiasticism covered Christendom. But the original comprehensiveness and flexibility of the genuine ministry remain scriptural facts, and a decisive criterion for all such questions.

The lapse of time—of ages—has thrown not a few illusions over the primitive ecclesiasticism. With modern Churchmen, the forms and nomenclature of the early ministry, borrowed, as merely expedient, from the Jews, have become absolutely essential conditions of Church validity. "Ordination" has become even a sacrament with the Greek and Latin Churches, and something hardly less with High-Church Protestants. So the classification of deacons, presbyters, and superintendents or bishops, (jointed in with the more promiscuous functional arrangements of the earlier period, when there were "teachers" as well as "pastors,") has become a divine order, necessary to the very constitution of the Church, in the estimation of many. To others, there seems to be no genuine idea of the ministry unless it includes the "pastoral" service, whereas all critical students of Church history know that the "pastors" were really secondary in the early Church; that most of her ministers were apostles and evangelists, flying about the world promulgating the new truth; and that the "pastors" and "teachers" were chiefly located presbyters and deacons, the latter being "servants" of the Church, many of them what would now be called laymen.

Even the word "preaching," we may remark in passing, has suffered by these illusions of time, as we have called them. Many Churchmen (Methodists as well as others) seem to think that there is no real preaching except in a pulpit, and on a text,

and with technical discriminations of the text, whereas the original preaching was substantially what is now good Methodist "exhortation." Its preachers had no pulpits for generations, except the platforms of the Jewish synagogues, scattered over the Roman empire; and these they hardly got on to before they were driven off again by their obstinate countrymen. And as to formal preaching, in the modern sense, they knew little or nothing about it. The "firstly," "secondly," and "thirdly" of the "sermon" were unknown to them, and did not appear in clerical literature till about the times of Origen. In fine, the original ministry was, comprehensively, an organization for the *propagandism* or outspread of the new truth all over the world. All kinds of laborers, competent for this work, were incorporated in it. They were put under wholesome regulations as fast as possible; were baptized for their work by the Holy Ghost; and the Church rejoiced and triumphed in its ever-growing host of prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, and "servants," or deacons and deaconesses. Clemens (of Alexandria) and Origen are known to us more as teachers of Christian schools than any thing else. St. John himself became a Christian school-teacher, as well as an apostle and prophet. And a glory will it be to Methodism when its Conferences shall be thronged with "teachers," and "evangelists," and "apostles," as well as "pastors." Any man called to "preach," but at the same time eminently capable of teaching in our academies or colleges, should work in the latter, and preach also whenever and wherever he can. He should have his place, and an honored one, among his ministerial brethren in the councils of the Church. Let us not disparage the noble ministerial service and character of our Fisks and Olins. When shall we perfect the "glorious Reformation" by the complete restoration of primitive Christianity in its simplicity and power? When shall we rend off the shackles of medieval ecclesiasticism, and stand forth in the freedom and victory of the apostolic propagandism? When shall Christianity cease entirely to be the grub of papal darkness, and, bursting its old ecclesiastical chrysalis, take wing and fly over the world, like the apocalyptic angel "flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people?"

The Reformers themselves, tenacious as they were of some figments of popery, were, as we have seen, in advance of our times respecting the doctrine of priesthood, and the true character of the Christian ministry. Methodism practically, and almost unconsciously, got nearly back to the apostolic programme; but we, ever and anon, stultify our own history, and propound notions which would nullify half our powers. What, for instance, are we doing with our old and divine "orders" of "exhorters" and "local preachers"—as divine, by the anointing of the Holy Ghost and historical usefulness, as any "order" among us? Well would it be for us to turn back to our glorious history and more glorious Gospel and abide by them.

Not only theoretically but historically the Methodist local ministry presents one of the very best exemplifications of the "priesthood of the people," of lay ministration. It would seem to be the very "desideratum" that other evangelical denominations are seeking, are "feeling after," under the prevailing conviction of the need of better co-operation of the laity with the clergy in the life and work of the Church. It needs, and must have, better recognition among us if we are not to lose disastrously our original power. For years it has been numerically almost twice as strong as the itinerant or "regular" ministry. It comprises a mighty, though mostly latent, force. It might be made a tremendous engine of evangelical power. It once was such, not only in England but in this country. It founded Methodism not only in Nova Scotia, Upper Canada, and New York, but all west of the Alleghanies, and in the West Indies, Australia, and Africa. With such an historical prestige, it is amazing that the Church has allowed it to practically lapse into comparative inefficiency, especially at this moment, when all other evangelical Churches are so eagerly inquiring how they can bring out their lay talents for the evangelical work of the age.

The usual reasoning on this change in our policy is, we think, quite illogical. The improvement of our regular ministry and of our congregations is certainly no relevant reason for it, for with this improvement has come a correspondent improvement of the *materiel* out of which to make effective local preachers. The Church is full of advanced laymen—teachers, legislators, lawyers, doctors, and others equally able—

whom she should set to work in her service, as she did in her old victorious days. But the very thought of the availability of these forces seems to have almost died out of the denomination in our older fields. Who can deny that there is as wide and urgent a field as ever there has been in our history, for such laborers, in the vast neglected suburbs of our great cities, and in our rural districts as well? Could these auxiliaries be worked systematically, they might indeed be redoubled in number without becoming superfluously abundant. Their standard of ability would be as well suited to the standard of intelligence in such fields as ever it was in our earlier history. The whole country needs just such religious workmen; its moral exigencies cry out for them, and the Church could hardly do a better work than to rally them, and inspirit and reorganize them for a new universal campaign.

Their better recognition would be an inestimable advantage to the regular ministry. Many of the latter are overworked, and yet see all around their stations neglected fields going to waste. Could they command licensed lay assistants for these waste places, and, directing their labors, garner their fruits in their Churches, many a feeble station would soon be powerfully reinforced, many a whole region now morally stagnant be awakened to religious inquiry and activity.

There has not been since the apostolic age, we repeat, a more striking example of the "priesthood of the people" than this "local ministry" of Methodism. Methodist history is full, as we have seen, of its achievements. It has pre-eminently been the recruiting service for our "regular" ministry. It is now estimated that the annual demand of our Conferences for recruits amounts to eight hundred. "Very soon," says one of our organs, "a thousand a year will be required to keep the itinerant ranks filled and to occupy new fields of labor." One thing is clear enough, namely, that we cannot expect this great but necessary reinforcement from our theological schools. We must keep up, or rather restore, our old recruiting method by graduating our young men through the orders of licensed "exhorters" and "local preachers" into the traveling ministry. This was our primitive process, and it filled the ranks of the itinerancy with the mightiest men that ever stood in the American pulpit. We need the theological school. We rec-

ommend every young candidate to go to it if he can. But we soberly believe that the day will be disastrous to Methodism when we come to rely exclusively upon our training schools for our ministerial supplies. Let us beware of any such Procrustean policy. It is alike incompatible with the genius and the prospective needs of our cause.

On the ground of the essential parity of the common membership of the Church, these and all other evangelical laborers belong to its common priesthood—to its one great scheme of universal evangelization. They differ in functional degrees and in consequent official dignity, (a comparatively small consideration, however,) but they are all baptized with, and "moved" by, the Holy Ghost to their work—a common work in general, however expediently discriminated in particular. Methodism has made a great historical "testimony" (as the Quakers would call it) on this subject of lay priesthood. Wesley always insisted that his local preachers were essentially laymen; yet the "call" of the Holy Spirit was with him their primary claim to authorization as preachers. He went further; he even held that his "regular" or "itinerant" preachers were not "clergymen," in the sense of the Anglican Church. In his latest sermon addressed to them he exhorts them to disclaim any such pretension. He esteemed them a lay ministry;* yet the conscious "call" of the Spirit was a condition of admission to his Conference. Both local and regular preachers in the American Methodist Church are required to have this "call" before admission to ordination.

There is no "radicalism" (in the bad sense of the term) in the foregoing ideas; they are the old truth, and the truth that must yet come forth all over Christendom if the world is to be saved. They are compatible, perfectly, with the highest system of order and responsibility, especially with our own Church order. What Methodism should always aim at, next to purity, is the freest possible activity, regulated by systematic order and responsibility. It has had a great theological mission in the world; its history may yet show that it has a greater ecclesiastical one. Contrary to the traditions of the National Church,

* In his original epitaph, in City Road Chapel, he was honored as Founder of the Methodist "Lay Ministry;" but the phrase was afterward changed to "Itinerant Ministry."

contrary to the prejudices of his own education, Wesley did, we insist, practically recognize the Lutheran and apostolic doctrine of the priesthood of the people. Methodism was founded by that fact, and could not otherwise have been founded. Methodists, throughout the world, should hold fast to the momentous fact, as one of the most notable lessons of their history.

Secondly. We infer from the subject the universal obligation of Christian labor, and the identity of the principle of its responsibility among all classes of Christian men.

As above stated and guarded, the doctrine of the priesthood of the people appears, we think, clear enough; but where in Christendom is it vividly and *practically* recognized? And yet, who does not perceive that it is the best, the only legitimate, solution of the problem of lay responsibility in Church life and labor; that, if luminously brought out in the pulpits of Protestantism, it would evoke the energies of the Church, as in a general resurrection from the dead; that our present vague, if not merely casual, lay activity, with hardly any distinct recognition of conscience in it, but rather a self-flattering substitution of "benevolence" for conscience, would soon take on the power and majesty of duty, of conscience, of a divine and indefeasible priestly commission?

Our men of "business" should learn that they have no more right to use their talents and success for merely selfish advantage than the pastors within their altars, the city missionaries who may be starving on their stinted contributions, or the evangelists whom they send to the ends of the earth, have to be equally selfish. Learning this, they would change the whole condition of the religious world, and in doing so they would, as we have shown, but restore primitive Christianity, reviving the original idea of the Church that all men who by regeneration have entered the kingdom of God have *come out* from the world, and must live, work, and, if need be, die, for the interests of that kingdom; that whatever difference of function, or mode of work, there may be, as between pastor and layman, and whatever difference in the degree of their responsibility, there is no difference in the principle of that responsibility; that it is universal; that the *one* talent will be held accountable as well as the two or five; that it was in the Divine Master's great lesson not the man of superiority,

nor he of mediocrity, but he of inferiority—he of the one talent, rather than of the two or five—who was lost and cast into "outer darkness." A universal consciousness of common responsibility—of common priestly consecration to the one great mission of the Church, the salvation of the world—working always and every-where; self-denial and self-sacrifice, even unto death, for the common cause: this was the spirit of the original Church. This, inspired by the Spirit from on high, enabled its fishermen, peasants, and publicans to come forth from the obscure Galilean villages and the humble "upper chambers" of Jerusalem to establish a world-wide realm while the Jewish State was sinking around them in its last decay; its quarrymen and slaves to come forth from the Roman Catacombs to confront the throne of the Cæsars and humble around its altars the senate, the schools, the armies, and the multitudinous populations of the empire of the world. The same working, self-denying spirit must pervade the Church again if ever it is to accomplish its appointed mission throughout the earth. Its secular men must understand that they are sacerdotal as well as secular—that though in the world, they are not of it. They are "not their own," but are "bought with a price," and should therefore "glorify God in their bodies and in their spirits, which are God's." Driving the plow, wielding the ax, or mingling in the throngs of the mart, they should remember that they bear a divine commission, and, while "providing for those of their own house," should consecrate their gains and their whole life as a ministration of the common priesthood. In no age and in no land has this duty been more urgent than it is among us in this New World, and here, if anywhere, should be revived in power the primitive policy of Christianity. Our country has now an area of more than four and a half millions of territory—nearly a million more than all Europe. What a geographical field has the American Church, then, here in its own immediate home-work! The Christianization of all Europe was not so grand a mission to the primitive Church. We are building up a moral empire which, by its better auspices and its wider relations to all the world, promises to be more important in the future of history than Europe has been in the past.

Our population is now estimated at about thirty-nine mill-

ions. Numerically, then, we may appear small by the side of Europe with her more than two hundred and ninety millions; but even this difference is but temporary. We are gaining on her at a rate which, were it not ascertained by authentic statistics, would seem incredible. We double our numbers in about a generation. By the end of the century they will have grown to about eighty millions. In about eighty years they will be equal to all the present population of Europe. According to the tables of longevity, there are some thousands of our children who will see that time. And what an epoch will that be, if the Republic but maintain its unity! That it will do so we have every reason to believe. Every motive of interest and ambition will dispose it to hold fast to its nationality, which is thus becoming every decade surpassingly grand. We have had enough of disunion and war to teach us the value of union and peace for a century at least.*

It is well for us thus to measure our future; not in the spirit of national vanity, but that we may appreciate the work before us and its immense responsibility. Our political and social mission may be sublime beyond that of any other contemporary people. A nation with one system of laws, free, intelligent, rife with industrial enterprise, and equivalent in territory and population to Europe, will be a fact without a parallel in the history of mankind. What a consummation, it has been said, would it be were all Europe itself to be thus one united, free, enlightened nationality, with one language and under one flag, from Spitzbergen to Malta, from Lisbon to Moscow! When that day comes for us, the mere moral power of our example can hardly fail to be omnipotent among the nations. But to reach this grand consummation we must, as never a people has before, work out our national advancement. We must educate the people; we must evangelize them; we must cover the continent with schools and churches, for the school-house and the church are the only sure fortifications of such a nation. We have done much in these respects, but, looking at our prospective wants, we have hardly more than begun the sublime task. Population is surging in upon us from Europe on the one hand and Asia on the other.

* For fuller statistical details on this subject see "The Centenary of American Methodism." New York. 1866.

The mighty waves roll over our prairies and mountains. Education and religion must keep up with them, or they will break down the strongholds of our public safety, and submerge the national morals and order. We must, more than ever, consecrate our ever-increasing wealth to the public good. Never has there been an equal field for public spirit and Christian zeal; never a more urgent summons to liberality, and heroic devotion to philanthropic work. To the American Christian, more than to any other on earth, has the divine precept that "no man liveth unto himself," become an irresistible truth. Let us confront boldly our unparalleled work. Its greatness should make us all great. The mission of this new world is not merely to make a great nationality, great materialistic improvements, great fortunes, but a great humanity. Great work is the best means of making great souls. Christian life may yet take a development here such as it has had nowhere else since the apostolic age, and such as may effect the triumph of Christianity throughout the world. This we may yet find to be the providential significance of our peculiar history and destiny.

We need this consecration of secular life the more urgently in this country to save our Christian men from our greatest national passion, the love of money—that passion which holy Scripture denounces as "the root of all evil," which is periling the very morals of trade among us, and which so often becomes what medical science must pronounce a species of mental disease, of actual mania. Brion, the philosopher, said to a miser, "You do not possess your wealth, but your wealth possesses you." There are some very curious revelations of human nature brought out by wealth, real "phenomena," well worth the study of thoughtful minds. As a representative of values, and as, therefore, the means of the acquisition of all things, except wisdom and virtue—and of even these to some extent—money is obviously a desirable possession, and what is called "competence" should be the aim of all men. But it is astonishing how an aim thus intrinsically wise, and among the wisest in human life, should be doomed almost always to overshoot its mark, as if there were some irony of fate mocking the calculations of shrewdness. Few men ever attain a just competence without apparently losing their capacity to appreciate

it. Some sinister power seems to play fantastic tricks with their calculations, and they think they see more need than ever of additional resources; their competence must be made secure by excessive surplusages; these again multiply the contingencies of fortune, and must themselves be fortified by additional securities, and thus the passion for gain goes on until the strangest transmutation takes place in the very reason of the man. His selfishness virtually defeats itself by losing the real advantages of wealth for wealth itself. The sinister power which has been playing its tricks with him becomes a stern and terrible Nemesis, puts out his eyes, and leads him blindly on, overburdened with treasure, while denying him the very enjoyments for which alone it is desirable. His shrewdness in making money remains; it will most probably increase, but it becomes an anomaly among the mental capacities; it is shrewdness against wisdom; it is logic without reasoning. Money, which is only a means, becomes an end, an overtopping, all-consuming end. It burdens life with cares and anxieties instead of relieving them; and the really poor victim of the irrational passion at last dies amid unused accumulations, which have only clogged his existence, especially in those most important later years of his life, when he has needed most repose and clearness of mind for both the infirmities of this life and the preparations of the life to come. What a terrible power of perversion has the love of wealth, when it thus becomes an habitual passion! What a really retributive power! Milton, speaking of the "fallen angels" before they fell, describes Mammon as somewhat mean, even in heaven, with brow prone downward in contemplating the "golden street." A clerical writer of long pastoral experience records that he has seen men reclaimed from every other vice, from the lowest debasement of every other passion, but never one fully saved from avarice. Many misers have been gathered into the communion of the Church, but how seldom has one ever been known to recover from the power of this demon more than temporarily? It would seem to be a sort of reprobation. Doubtless to an earnest penitent the grace of God is omnipotent; but, alas! how hard it seems for a devotee of Mammon to become an earnest penitent—to rend off and hurl away his golden fetters!

Money-making men have, then, a grave liability to watch against. Their besetting passion is, perhaps, the most insidious of vices; it coils like a gliding snake around them, till they are wrapped inextricably in its folds. But, on the other hand, wealth is one of the grandest advantages if rightly applied. The talent to make it is God-given, and they who have that talent should use it to the utmost as a most precious endowment for the good of the world. It promotes business; it gives industrial employment to the poor; it prompts invention; it advances civilization. Wealth is capital; and there can be no great industrial enterprise, no advanced civilization, without capital. Money can have the highest consecration; it can establish great and perpetual institutions of education, of charitable and scientific relief to human suffering, of religious propagandism. It is astonishing that successful business men do not more generally perceive these its noblest uses. The grateful recognition of communities, and of posterity, is a worthy, a virtuous object of ambition; but what commemorative monuments can equal those which rich men can erect to themselves in hospitals, colleges, church edifices, public libraries? In these, it has been justly observed, they may live on, ages after death, a more effective life than they ever had in the flesh, and with ever augmenting rewards in eternity. Many a man of wealth would give his fortune for the fame of a Da Vinci, a Raphael, or a Michael Angelo; but money cannot buy genius; it may, however, buy something better—higher usefulness, and equally enduring and more grateful remembrance in the heart of the world. How can a Christian capitalist forego such possibilities?

We are the more urgent in pressing the doctrine of the priesthood of the people on the attention of successful Christian "men of business," because in this country they have special advantages. In no other nation has wealth afforded such ample means for usefulness. The official census shows that, in 1850, the amount of our property, real and personal, was $7,000,000,000; by 1860 it advanced to more than $16,000,000,000; by 1870 to $30,000,000,000. There is no other recorded example of such a growth of wealth. It is a possibility only of the new world. In ten years our aggregate property much more than doubled; in twenty years it much

more than quadrupled. All this advance, let us remember, has been made in the present generation; in about two thirds the time of a generation. Evidently, wealth and luxury will overwhelm us unless corrected by a better standard of Christian life and liberality. All these means, among Christian men, belong legitimately to the Church, for these men are its "royal priesthood."

We believe that a just, a really sober view of this subject, such as is implied in the "priesthood of the people," would make an epoch in Christian civilization, and we are not without hope that wealth is yet destined to such a consecration. Examples occur in England and in this country increasingly. They may yet become a rule, rather than an exception, among Christian capitalists. Not until then will sound reason and sound religion have their normal sway in the business life of Christendom.

But let it not be thought that because we thus speak of "men of business," "men of fortune," the Christian obligation we have been discussing chiefly devolves upon them. As the priestly function is common, it applies to the humblest spheres of life. There is not one of us who is not here on earth in the order of Divine Providence, and with a providential work before us. We can minister in our "holy priesthood" at our family altars, in our workshops, in our neighborly relations. Our hard-earned pittances may be the most acceptable offerings presented in the temple. Christ has consecrated forever, in the memory of his Church, the poor widow's mite, and her example, says a great divine, has done more for the charities of Christendom than the conversion of Constantine. Say not, ye poor and humble ones, that you can do nothing. There is not a day, scarcely an hour, in which ye cannot scatter about you the good seed. It was precisely in those lowly spheres of life in which you move that early Christianity began its work and laid its imperishable foundations. By converse, neighbor with neighbor, by household meetings in "upper chambers," by charities in the name of their Lord, by pure living and meek and brave suffering, as well as by apostolic preaching, they swept away at last the imperial heathenism of the Roman world.

And Christian women may well remember the devout women

who ministered to Christ, and who are incessantly alluded to in the Acts and the Epistles as helpers of the apostles—the deaconesses and prophetesses of the New Dispensation. The New Dispensation recognizes them in the common priesthood. They should be the vestal priestesses at its altars. Do they complain of the limitations on their Christian usefulness, the never-ending drudgery and toil of their homes? Let them remember that every Christian household should be a church; every nursery a sanctuary; every cradle a shrine at which the maternal priestess may kneel with prayers for the young immortal who, if trained for heaven, shall, in the language of Christ, be equal unto the angels. What if an infant cherub, winged and radiant, should accidentally drop from heaven into a Christian matron's home; would she not deem its care a divine and blessed responsibility? How would she love and nurture it, till some kindred messenger from the skies should come to reclaim it! How would its presence honor her house! All the streets leading thither would be thronged with wondering and reverent multitudes, eager to behold the celestial sight. All the world would report and discuss the marvelous fact. But such homes have already as high and holy an honor; many of them have whole groups of young angels, as immortal as any in higher worlds. They "have entertained angels unawares." No priesthood on earth is higher or more capable than that of Christian maternity. Its ministry extends at last into the "holiest of holies" of the very heavens.

Has God endowed a Christian woman with special gifts for usefulness in the Church? The gifts themselves are the warrant of her right to use them. "Let all things be done decently and in order," is indeed a divine maxim, and woman's heart will instinctively recognize it; but an extreme construction of St. Paul's views of female decorum in the congregation is, we think, a general fault of our modern Church-life. A large portion of our Church-life consists of social religious services. What would any other form of social life, any other social gatherings, be if the women present were required to be mute spectators? Would not such a conventionalism absolutely spoil our social life generally? Paul did not allow women to speak in the "ecclesia," but why apply this to the familiar social assemblies of Christians, even if it were applicable to

more public occasions? Paul, as we have seen, recognizes the saintly services of women, of "deaconesses" and "prophetesses." And even if he advised their non-interference in the "ecclesia," yet he did not institute the interdiction as *perpetual.* It was evidently a matter of conventional decorum, a concession to the peculiar oriental or pagan manners of the age, in countries in which women were extremely restricted. It was prudence in the Church not to outrage in such things the long-established customs of the East. Primitive Christianity was eminently prudent, though in all essential matters heroic. Certainly the Oriental conventionalism regarding women, requiring them, in some sections, to be always vailed when abroad, (as to-day in the Levant generally,) to sit apart and behind screens in religious congregations even among the Jews, were not matters of divine morality, but merely of local custom. Christianity in such cases, as in the more important one of slavery, did not declare direct war, but chose rather to put in operation general principles of moral training, which should, sooner or later, uproot the evil. Assuredly Paul's concession to his times, on female decorum in the Christian assembly, has been essentially modified by our different civilization. Methodism, then, we think, is right in the freedom it accords the sex in its Church-life. It has found, with Quakerism, that a degree of feminine activity in religious life, which would have been entirely inadmissible in the ancient East, is perfectly compatible with the decorum of social, and even public, worship, and can give a gentle and hallowed dignity to the offices of the sanctuary. Good order, directed by good sense, must control this matter in the Churches; but nothing can ever invalidate the claim of woman, as a member of the Christian communion, to the right of the common "priesthood of the people."

Thirdly. May we not infer from this review of the subject that there is still much of popery to be purged away from our Protestantism? Do not its "fag ends" cling to nearly the whole apparel of the Church? The two principal characteristics of popery are its hierarchical distinctions and its abject subjection to authority. Thence have come its chief corruptions and its imperious uncharitableness, and thence also its present calamities and decadence. We have seen how simple

and democratic was original Christianity. We look in vain in the New Testament for the official distinctions and powers of the medieval Church; but do we not find traces of them to-day in nearly all our Church polities? If they stifled the religious life of the laity in that Church, do they not shackle it, at least, in most of our Protestant communions? And can our faith ever have its free and full activity in the world till we break off and throw from us these fetters? Does not also "authority" still dominate over us, giving undue importance to secondary matters, restricting the free action of the Christian conscience, or forcing it to break away into eccentric and perilous liberties, into sectarian divisions, and then again binding it with fetters of opinionativeness and bigotry within the sects? Have we ever pondered well the grand facts that the primitive Church was without an authoritatively defined Creed for three hundred years, and still longer without an authoritatively determined Canon, and that these were the years of its saintliest purity, of its most glorious army of martyrs, and of its sublimest territorial triumphs? In this ante-Nicene period it marched victoriously over most of the known world. In the purity and freedom of its spirit it recognized the apostolic writings, though it read innumerable apocryphal books; it held faithfully the essential doctrinal truth, forming it by gradual accretions into what was called the Apostles' Creed, (not as written by the apostles, but as expressing their fundamental teachings,) though the symbol differed in form in different lands. It preserved its spiritual life not by its "orthodoxy," but its orthodoxy by its spiritual life. The later Church has reversed the process. Functional distinctions are good, creeds are good; as matters of expediency they may be necessary in some cases; but as obligative instead of indicative, as authoritative rather than convenient, they are destructive of the liberty wherewith Christ makes us free. They have converted Christianity into hierarchism and dogmatism. Designed for the preservation of orthodoxy, they have become provocatives of heresy. Aiming at the unity of the Church, they have rent it into universal factions. But, most fatal of all their effects, by impairing its catholicity and charity they have impaired its spiritual life, and to a great extent paralyzed its beneficent working power.

Finally, from the vantage ground which we have reached in this discussion, we think we may catch some glimpses of "the Church of the future"—that ideal so eagerly sought in our day. The Methodists, with their growing hosts, the Baptists, with their zeal and their missionary expansion, the "Liberalists," with their "free thought," dream of that glory as their own. We dare not share their illusions. We see a better fate coming for the Church and the world—an era in which good men will look back to our weaknesses and petty and petulant sectarianisms with something of the wonder with which we contemplate the follies of the medieval Church. God will purify us as by fire, fusing and blending us, and bringing us forth a transformed "Church of the future." One thing only are we sure of, that the Church which attains the most individual purity of life, the most charity, and the most working energy, will have the best prestige for the future. Ever still, as of old, is the sublime declaration true that "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

Art. III. — PETER CARTWRIGHT, AND PREACHING IN THE WEST.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

In 1856, after a ministry of fifty-three years, Cartwright, yielding to long-continued importunities, decided to publish his autobiography. In his earlier ministry Cartwright kept a journal of his travels, that he might thus record the progress of Methodism; but finding that several of his co-laborers were doing the same, he concluded there was too much writing on the same subject, and abandoned his manuscript to mice and maggots, not troubling himself to make another note.

We cannot too much deplore this decision, and his preface expresses his own regret at it, since it has prevented his giving just order and precision to the existing work. Cartwright's journal would have been far preferable to the book we now have. It would have shown us the preacher in his every-day life, brought us to the scene of his labors, his joys, and sorrows, and would at the same time have presented a picture, taken on

the spot, of the material and moral life of the West at the opening of the century. But now, as Cartwright takes up the pen in later life, he is rather intent upon giving us an *edifying* book than upon recounting the details of his own life. He, indeed, puts these as much as possible out of view, purposing only to glorify his God and his Church. He loves with a true filial affection this Methodist Church, which awakened in his youthful heart the desire for salvation, and which has made a poor pioneer the instrument of so many conversions. He rejoices in all its successes, and laments all the dissensions which embarrass or the defections which weaken it. He gives us a register of the yearly accessions to the Lord's flock, and furnishes a minute account of the labors of the Conferences and of their discussions, to which he listens as if the fate of the universe depended on the movements which agitate a sect of the American Church. With the intent of moral edification, his pen abounds in anecdotes. He makes record of obdurate sinners suddenly converted, of saints backslidden and recovered, of wicked men stricken by the judgments of God, hypocrites unmasked, heretics or atheists confounded.

Every sect has its store of pious narratives where Satan and the rival sects are well abused, and it is specially a book of this order that Cartwright has given us to glorify American Methodism. But here, as might well be expected in a narrative of his own life, while making war against the demon, the Baptists, Unitarians, and Universalists, he cannot avoid sometimes putting himself upon the scene; and so amid the monotony, more moral than amusing, of the narrative, his own powerful and original personality stands forth presented in vivid and piquant traits.

Peter Cartwright was born September 1, 1785, on the banks of the River James, in Virginia. His parents were poor; and his father, who had borne arms during the war of Independence, resolved when peace was made to emigrate to Kentucky with all his family. Having remained some time in Lincoln County, he pushed further on and established himself permanently in Logan County, quite at the outer limits of European settlements, and close upon the present borders of Tennessee. Peter Cartwright therefore knew no other life than that of the pioneers; he grew up in the midst of the woods, and for his

primary education learned only to read, write, and cipher a little. He was ardently devoted to all the amusements of the country, and his father made him the happiest of boys by presenting him with a race-horse and a pack of cards. His mother sorrowed over the dissipated tastes of her son. She was a woman of strict piety; she had been converted to Methodism in Virginia, and she kept herself constantly in cordial relation with the Methodist preachers who visited from time to time this remote corner of Kentucky.

His mother's remonstrances finally awakened conviction in the soul of young Cartwright, and he had been for months in great distress of mind, when a camp-meeting was held some three miles from his father's house. He went thither with the crowd who were attracted by the reputation of the celebrated preacher John Page, and here under the preaching he found relief. He was taken into the Methodist Church at sixteen years of age. His natural ardor soon displayed itself in the direction of religion. At the assemblies which he thenceforth regularly attended he felt irresistibly impelled to speak; he would mount a bench, pray aloud, or make an address, the fervor and emotional tone of which deeply moved his auditors. So some months afterward, at a quarterly meeting in the spring of 1802, the preacher in charge came to him, and, to his great surprise, bestowed upon him a regular exhorter's license. He vainly essayed to decline; the preacher was convinced of Cartwright's call, and made it a case of conscience for him to pursue the ministry. In the autumn of this same year Cartwright's father, in a process of speculation usual with the pioneers, sold his existing establishment and passed beyond the River Cumberland into a region quite new, where cultivation was but just begun. Although his residence was now at least thirty leagues from the route of any preacher, Cartwright did not fail to seek out John Page in order to obtain a certificate of membership for himself and several of his family. Page immediately granted Cartwright a license, which authorized him to travel over the region whither he had emigrated, to convoke meetings, form classes, and, in a word, to organize a circuit, while account of these labors was to be rendered at the quarterly meeting of the following autumn. This was to invest Cartwright, who had yet hardly passed his eighteenth

year, with all the functions of a traveling preacher. The young man shrank from this responsibility; he pleaded the meagerness of his education and his need of further preparatory study. Page responded that preaching would be the best school for him. During the winter he could do nothing on the farm; he might then pass the time at a school if one were accessible; but on the opening of spring, as soon as it was possible to travel, he must put himself upon his work of preaching and leave the result to the Lord. The young man could not avoid compliance; he felt, indeed, an inward fire which was devouring him, and which must have vent. He went to Lexington and studied in the academy, where, besides the elements of an ordinary education, the dead languages were taught. Here he studied with eagerness, but his stay was short; his severe manners and strict life invited much persecution, and he gladly returned home to prepare for his mission. These few months at Lexington furnished all the regular education that Cartwright received. Let it not, however, be supposed that he remained an illiterate man. All his leisure hours were thenceforth devoted to study; he pursued his reading during winter and on his travels under direction of older brethren in the ministry; and besides acquiring with such aid, a knowledge of the dead languages and of theology, he studied privately law, mathematics, and natural philosophy.

Cartwright at first regarded his mission as only a local and temporary one; but the success which followed his first year's efforts caused him to look upon it differently. The elder on the circuit was not willing to lose so valuable a recruit; he went to Cartwright's father, and in the name of religion besought him to let his son devote himself to the ministry. It was a great sacrifice for a pioneer to lose the labor of a son at eighteen who was tall, robust, intelligent, and an excellent plowman. Therefore the father refused; but the mother, whose conscience was alarmed at the idea of resisting so manifest a call of God, intervened, and obtained by her entreaties the desired consent. Cartwright himself was very hesitant. If he found it a joy to preach in his own neighborhood, to renounce his home-life for the rough experiences of an itinerant was another thing. His mother decided him.

Behold, then, this child of the woods, apparently destined

only to wield the mattock and the ax, now, without a previous thought of it, and, with no preparation, enrolled, almost despite himself, under the banner of militant Methodism. Whether he has well discharged his trust the *résumé* which he himself makes of his labors may show:

I have traveled eleven circuits and twelve districts; have received into the Methodist Episcopal Church, on probation and by letter, 10,000; have baptized, of children, 8,000; of adults, 4,000. For fifty-three years, whenever appointed to a circuit or district, I formed a plan, and named every place where and when I preached; and also the text of Scripture from which I preached; the number of conversions, of baptisms, and the number that joined the Church. From these old plans, though there are some imperfections, yet I can come very near stating the number of times that I have tried to preach. For twenty years of my early ministry I often preached twice a day, and sometimes three times. We seldom ever had, in those days, more than one rest day in a week; so that I feel very safe in saying that I preached four hundred times a year. This would make, in twenty years, eight thousand sermons. For the last thirty-three years, I think I am safe in saying I have averaged four sermons a week, or at least two hundred sermons a year, making, in thirty-three years, 6,600. Total, 14,600.

Cartwright's success honored the judgment of John Page, who had seen in him a popular preacher. His extreme youth imparted an additional attraction to his speech. There was soon but one opinion of him in the West, and the people flocked from great distances to hear the *Kentucky boy*. He himself spared no travel nor labor. One of his first circuits embraced a large part of Ohio, having not less than a hundred leagues circumference. Cartwright was obliged to cross the Ohio River four times at each quarterly round.

He had often still more extended circuits, and must travel over one hundred and fifty leagues to be present at the annual conferences of the preachers. During fifty-three years he missed only one of these conferences by reason of sickness. His allowance as salary was $80 a year, and very often he did not receive half of it, and would have lacked the necessities of life without assistance from his family. Many preachers after some years of this hard experience abandoned their pursuit, located, and adopted some occupation which would afford a living. Cartwright, unmoved by discouragement, looked upon

his empty purse without fear, and trusted in Providence to fill it.

I had been from my father's house about three years; was five hundred miles from home; my horse had gone blind; my saddle was worn out; my bridle reins had been eaten up and replaced (after a sort) at least a dozen times; and my clothes had been patched till it was difficult to detect the original. I had concluded to try to make my way home and get another outfit. I was in Marietta, and had just seventy-five cents in my pocket. How I would get home and pay my way I could not tell.

But it was of no use to parley about it; go I must, or do worse; so I concluded to go as far as I could, and then stop and work for more means, till I got home. I had some few friends on the way, but not many; so I cast ahead.

My first day's travel was through my circuit. At about thirty-five miles' distance there lived a brother with whom I intended to stay all night. I started, and late in the evening, within five miles of my stopping-place, fell in with a widow lady, not a member of the Church, who lived several miles off my road. She had attended my appointments in that settlement all the year. After the usual salutations, she asked me if I was leaving the circuit.

I told her I was, and had started for my father's.

"Well," said she, "how are you off for money? I expect you have received but little on this circuit."

I told her I had but seventy-five cents in the world. She invited me home with her, and told me she would give me a little to help me on. But I told her I had my places fixed to stop every night till I got to Maysville; and if I went home with her it would derange all my stages, and throw me among strangers. She then handed me a dollar, saying it was all she had with her, but if I would go home with her she would give me more. I declined going with her, thanked her for the dollar, bade her farewell, moved on, and reached my lodging-place.

By the time I reached the Ohio River, opposite Maysville, my money was all gone. I was in trouble about how to get over the river, for I had nothing to pay my ferriage.

I was acquainted with Brother J. Armstrong, a merchant in Maysville, and concluded to tell the ferry-man that I had no money, but if he would ferry me over I could borrow twenty-five cents from Armstrong, and would pay him. Just as I got to the bank of the river he landed, on my side, with a man and a horse; and when the man reached the bank I saw it was Colonel M. Shelby, brother to Governor Shelby, of Kentucky. He was a lively exhorter in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and an old acquaintance and neighbor of my father's.

When he saw me he exclaimed,

"Peter, is that you?"

"Yes, Moses," said I, "what little is left of me."

"Well," said he, "from your appearance you must have seen hard times. Are you trying to get home?"

"Yes," I answered.

"How are you off for money, Peter?" said he.

"Well, Moses," said I, "I have not a cent in the world."

"Well," said he, "here are three dollars, and I will give you a bill of the road and a letter of introduction till you get down into the barrens at the Pilot Knob."

You may be sure my spirits greatly rejoiced. So I passed on very well for several days and nights on the colonel's money and credit, but when I came to the first tavern beyond the Pilot Knob my money was out. What to do I did not know, but I rode up and asked for quarters. I told the landlord I had no money; had been three years from home, and was trying to get back to my father's. I also told him I had a little old watch, and a few good books in my saddle-bags, and I would compensate him in some way. He bade me alight and be easy.

Cartwright saw the conversion of the tavern keeper who would take nothing from him; he met still other friends, and found new converts who were glad to entertain him gratuitously.

Next day I reached home with six and a quarter cents unexpended. Thus I have given you a very imperfect little sketch of the early travel of a Methodist preacher in the Western Conference. My parents received me joyfully. I tarried with them several weeks. My father gave me a fresh horse, a bridle and saddle, some new clothes, and forty dollars in cash. Thus equipped, I was ready for another three years' absence.

See this man, always ready and always cheerful, as he strives to obey the precept, "Be instant in season and out of season." He feels, indeed, a little hesitation when he is sent, for the first time, to preach to the *Yankees*, since he had never seen one, and these people were supposed to be special enemies to religious zeal, very orderly and ceremonious in their habits, accustomed to fine language, and quick to criticise; but seeing that duty calls, he goes forth boldly to confront these sharp tongues. At the least invitation, or even at the slightest chance of winning a soul, he mounts a table, a bench, or trunk of a tree, and begins to preach. If traveling in a public conveyance, he draws the conversation to the subject of religion, and is sure to make some converts among his companions. If he asks the hospitality of a house, he solicits permission to pray with and for the occupants. If an infidel host locks him into his chamber, he begins to pray with a loud voice, so that

the sound awakens the Christian sympathy of the infidel's wife. Nothing discourages him, nothing wearies him; he can preach three days and three nights if it is necessary; but he never leaves a place without success in the work of God. Of all the scenes in which he has figured, perhaps the most interesting is the following, which might be entitled "The Preacher at the Ball."

Saturday night came on, and found me in a strange region of country, and in the hills, knobs, and spurs of the Cumberland Mountains. I greatly desired to stop on the approaching Sabbath, and spend it with a Christian people; but I was now in a region of country where there was no Gospel minister for many miles around, and where, as I learned, many of the scattered population had never heard a Gospel sermon in all their lives, and where the inhabitants knew no Sabbath only to hunt and visit, drink and dance. Thus lonesome and pensive, late in the evening, I hailed at a tolerably decent house, and the landlord kept entertainment. I rode up and asked for quarters. The gentleman said I could stay, but he was afraid I would not enjoy myself very much as a traveler, inasmuch as they had a party meeting there that night to have a little dance. I inquired how far it was to a decent house of entertainment on the road; he said seven miles. I told him if he would treat me civilly and feed my horse well, by his leave I would stay. He assured me I should be treated civilly. I dismounted and went in. The people collected, a large company. I saw there was not much drinking going on.

I quietly took my seat in one corner of the house, and the dance commenced. I sat quietly musing, a total stranger, and greatly desired to preach to this people. Finally, I concluded to spend the next day (Sabbath) there, and ask the privilege to preach to them. I had hardly settled this point in my mind, when a beautiful, ruddy young lady walked very gracefully up to me, dropped a handsome courtesy, and pleasantly, with winning smiles, invited me out to take a dance with her. I can hardly describe my thoughts or feelings on that occasion. However, in a moment I resolved on a desperate experiment. I rose as gracefully as I could; I will not say with some emotion, but with many emotions. The young lady moved to my right side; I grasped her right hand with my right hand, while she leaned her left arm on mine. In this position we walked on the floor. The whole company seemed pleased at this act of politeness in the young lady, shown to a stranger. The colored man, who was the fiddler, began to put his fiddle in the best order. I then spoke to the fiddler to hold a moment, and added that for several years I had not undertaken any matter of importance without first asking the blessing of God upon it, and I desired now to ask the blessing of God upon this beautiful young lady and the

whole company, that had shown such an act of politeness to a total stranger.

Here I grasped the young lady's hand tightly, and said, "Let us all kneel down and pray," and then instantly dropped on my knees, and commenced praying with all the power of soul and body that I could command. The young lady tried to get loose from me, but I held her tight. Presently she fell on her knees. Some of the company kneeled, some stood, some fled, some sat still, all looked curious. The fiddler ran off into the kitchen, saying, "Lord a marcy, what de matter? what is dat mean?"

While I prayed some wept, and wept out aloud, and some cried for mercy. I rose from my knees and commenced an exhortation, after which I sang a hymn. The young lady who invited me on the floor lay prostrate, crying earnestly for mercy. I exhorted again, I sang and prayed nearly all night. About fifteen of that company professed religion, and our meeting lasted next day and next night, and as many more were powerfully converted.

It is a fine thing to see Cartwright contending for his converts with the preachers of other sects, especially the Baptists, who came to glean behind him, and who sought to gain a part of his flock. He had a thousand devices to bring these trespassers into all kinds of snares, and to cover them with confusion. When he takes the offensive he uses the same skill in attack as in defense. If he is unknown in the region he will play the *rôle* of a convert seeking instruction, and by question after question in the Socratic method he will come to show up the absurdity of his teachers' doctrine. These are the battles and victories in which he delights; but speak not to him of other conquests, nor think that he cares in the least for the great things of this world. One day as he was preaching in a brother's church on this text, "For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" he felt some one twitching his coat, and heard the brother minister whisper in his ear, "General Jackson has just come in." Cartwright was greatly vexed at this officious movement, and spoke out so that all could hear, "Who is General Jackson? If he is not converted God will damn him as surely as the lowest negro." Great was the trepidation of the minister, who took Cartwright to task after the service, and assured him that the general would not fail to chastise his insolence. "I don't believe it," said Cartwright; "the general will rather approve my conduct; but if he should undertake any thing like

chastisement, there would be two of us at that game, as the proverb runs."

Thereupon the minister goes of his own accord to excuse the matter with the general, who seems not to have been much pleased with the interference, for on meeting Cartwright afterward in the street he at once accosted him, saying, "Mr. Cartwright, you are a man after my own heart. I am much surprised that any one could have supposed me offended at you. I can only approve your independence; a minister of Jesus Christ ought to love every body and fear no mortal man. If I only had a few thousand officers as independent and fearless as you, and a good army, I could conquer England." Since human nature is always the same, Cartwright, after having reported this incident, so flattering to himself, could not help adding, "General Jackson is certainly a most extraordinary man."

It was at the camp-meeting that Cartwright found himself in his element; but here, especially, he needed all that resolution which General Jackson so much admired in him. These great multitudes inspired him, and the idea of the good to be accomplished transported and bore him up against all fatigue. All day long he preached, sang hymns, and exhorted the preachers who flocked around him; by night he watched and prayed, seemingly forgetful of all repose, although the camp-meetings were prolonged for a week or more. And what holy indignation, what commanding power he displayed against those who sought to impede the work of God! Peddlers would establish themselves in the vicinity and offer spirituous liquors for sale. Cartwright sought out the magistrates, and by easy or importunate persuasion obtained orders for the removal of the sellers. If the silence of the law were pleaded, and liberty claimed for such nuisances, he would take the lead, and the people in force would carry off the liquor, putting it safely under lock and key till the breaking up of the camp. Families which came in a body to the camp often embraced some members, young people particularly, who, with little or no interest in religious matters, came simply out of curiosity and for the sake of amusement. There were others who declared open hostility to those meetings, and prided themselves upon making as much disturbance as possible. They would collect frogs

and throw them among the crowd at the most pathetic passages of the sermon; they would conspire to throw fire-crackers into the camp at night, to catch the preachers and toss them in blankets, or to draw a wagon occupied by sleepers into the quagmire

Cartwright happily kept good watch; he posted his sentinels, and he himself often went the rounds. Whoever came about for mischief at such times was only too glad to get away with all speed. A certain scapegrace, who had sworn to turn a preacher's wagon into the river, was about to accomplish his design, when he suddenly found himself seized by the collar. Cartwright, who, armed with a stout club, had caught the rogue, took him straight to the water and gave him, under threat of a drubbing, a forced bath. Sometimes Cartwright would come to an understanding with his enemies: he would transform some of them into allies; would bring them into a treaty to guarantee the tranquillity of his camp on condition of being allowed to carry on their diversions at a distance. One day when some rude fellows had in this manner become the defenders of order, there came a young fop, proud of his long hair, frizzed and curled in the latest fashion, who insisted upon sitting on the side reserved for the ladies. As no persuasion could induce him to move, Cartwright claimed the promised service, and the young fellow was seized by the preacher's new allies, taken beyond the circle and closely cropped. Sometimes, it is true, great animosity and passion were manifested; no peaceable agreement was possible, and force alone could secure quiet for the assembly. Cartwright never hesitated, was intimidated by no menace, and was the first to incur personal danger.

Our last quarterly meeting was a camp-meeting. We had a great many tents, and a large turn-out for a new country, and, perhaps, there never was a greater collection of rabble and rowdies. They came drunk, and armed with dirks, clubs, knives, and horse-whips, and swore they would break up the meeting. After interrupting us very much on Saturday night, they collected early on Sunday morning, determined on a general riot. At eight o'clock I was appointed to preach. About the time I was half through my discourse two very fine-dressed young men marched into the congregation with loaded whips, and hats on, and rose up and stood in the midst of the ladies, and began to laugh and talk. They were near the stand, and I requested

them to desist and get off the seats; but they cursed me and told me to mind my own business, and said they would not get down. I stopped trying to preach, and called for a magistrate. There were two at hand, but I saw they were both afraid. I ordered them to take these men into custody, but they said they could not do it. I told them, as I left the stand, to command me to take them, and I would do it at the risk of my life. I advanced toward them. They ordered me to stand off, but I advanced. One of them made a pass at my head with his whip, but I closed in with him and jerked him off the seat. A regular scuffle ensued. The congregation by this time were all in commotion. I heard the magistrates give general orders, commanding all friends of order to aid in suppressing the riot. In the scuffle I threw my prisoner down, and held him fast; he tried his best to get loose; I told him to be quiet, or I would pound his chest well. The mob rose and rushed to the rescue of the two prisoners, for they had taken the other young man also. An old and drunken magistrate came up to me, and ordered me to let my prisoner go. I told him I should not. He swore if I did not he would knock me down. I told him to crack away. Then one of my friends at my request took hold of my prisoner, and the drunken justice made a pass at me; but I parried the stroke, and seized him by the collar and the hair of the head, and fetching him a sudden jerk forward brought him to the ground and jumped on him. I told him to be quiet or I would pound him well. The mob then rushed to the scene; they knocked down seven magistrates and several preachers and others. I gave up my drunken prisoner to another, and threw myself in front of the friends of order. Just at this moment the ringleader of the mob and I met; he made three passes at me, intending to knock me down. The last time he struck at me, by the force of his own effort he threw the side of his face toward me. It seemed at that moment I had not power to resist temptation, and I struck a sudden blow in the burr of the ear and dropped him to the earth. Just at that moment the friends of order rushed by hundreds on the mob, knocking them down in every direction. In a few minutes the place became too strait for the mob, and they wheeled and fled in every direction; but we secured about thirty prisoners, marched them off to a vacant tent, and put them under guard till Monday morning, when they were tried, and every man was fined to the utmost limits of the law. The aggregate amount of fines and costs was near three hundred dollars. They fined my old drunken magistrate twenty dollars, and returned him to court, and he was cashiered of his office.

It is easy to suppose that such a conflict would throw all minds into agitation, and it would seem impossible to restore calmness in a multitude so heated with the struggle; no preacher would undertake to speak. Cartwright alone, whose

conscience was clear because he believed he had but done his duty and followed the demands of necessity, seemed to rise above the general dejection; he sought the presiding elder, who was more discouraged than all others, and requested the privilege of preaching. The trumpet called the assembly; he mounted the platform, took for his text, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and at the end of half an hour the power of God, according to his favorite phrase, was felt in the whole congregation. This energetic and decided character, who knew how to secure advantage in the most unfavorable circumstances, whom the most unforeseen occurrences found always prepared, would be specially pleasing to the easily swayed population of the West, in whose eyes force, whether moral or physical, was the certain sign of superiority. The facility with which Cartwright passed from grave to gay, his fertility in anecdote and similitude, his cutting sarcasm and sudden bursts of impetuosity, even his eccentricities, all were in contrast with the solemn and set manners of the ordinary preachers, all charmed and captivated the multitude. He was without equal as a purely extemporaneous speaker; he must be inspired by the sight of a crowd, by some view of nature, or some special circumstances, and the preparations of closet study availed him little. The General Conference was once held in Boston, and the Methodists, whom the other sects affected somewhat to despise as an uncultured class, felt called upon to present a good figure in a city like the Athens of America. They sought to put forward the flower of their pulpit talent, and counted specially upon Cartwright. The latter was well impressed with the importance of sustaining not only his own reputation and the honor of the Church, but that also of the Western people, and took great pains to prepare two sermons. The Bostonians only said that he preached like others. Mortified at such a judgment, he set out the third time in utter freedom from preparation, preached as if he were in the woods, and achieved immense success.

With so much popularity as he enjoyed in the West, Cartwright might have aspired to any civil honor; but he always kept himself out of politics, and if he once sought the suffrages of his fellow-citizens it was from conviction of duty. He had settled with his family in Illinois, when the Legislature was

hesitating about the repeal of the law abolishing slavery. Cartwright readily allowed himself to be chosen as deputy that he might speak and vote against the repeal, and as soon as victory was secured he refused to be longer a candidate. He seems to have conceived during his short civil career an unfavorable notion of the prevalent political morality. He had specially a bitter memory of his own treatment in the attacks to which he was subject from the moment of his appearing as a candidate. He was even accused of refusing to pay his debts and of perjury. He treated his political adversaries in the same style as he did his religious opponents, and with like success. Meeting one day a voter who had sworn to give him a horse-whipping, Cartwright made himself known, said he did not wish to live in perpetual apprehension, and demanded of his adversary the immediate execution of his menace. At the same time he rolled up his sleeves ready for the encounter, but thereupon was only met by the proffer of his opponent's hand in reconciliation, and the latter was subsequently his warmest partisan.

A General Conference of the American Methodist Church was held at Indianapolis in 1857. The English Methodists were then represented by a delegate, Dr. Jobson, who saw and heard Cartwright, then in his seventy-third year, and he gives the following account of him:

"The second person in the assembly in weight of years is Dr. Peter Cartwright, a tall, robust man, whose physiognomy and speech both betray a mingling of primitive simplicity with a large touch of humor. His flesh, solid as marble, his rough and determined air, bespeak a man of intrepidity and habituation to fatigue. Yet the signs of good humor and kindness are not wanting, for his mouth, eyes, and mobile cheeks show a sympathetic and tender nature. His head is strong, and reposes firmly upon large and robust shoulders; his forehead is large, and covered with a forest of gray hair. His eyes, of very deep color, gleam like two fires under the bristling eyebrows, and the two wrinkles seen at the corners present a marked feature in his physiognomy. His skin is much browned by the sun. His voice trembles when he begins to speak, but soon he recovers his old power, and the rich tones of the organ are at his command. The orator appears in it

and plays skillfully all its chords. At times, to sharpen his darts and make them more penetrating, he assumes derisively a tragic tone and air; then, after having related some anecdote which convulses his auditors with laughter, while nothing of his own solemn gravity is lost, he falls upon his antagonist with an irresistible vigor and crushes him with sarcasm. Is he aroused by the presence of numerous opponents, he sends forth, stroke upon stroke, keen arguments, arrows lively and burning like lightning; then, with voice unchecked as a tempest in the woods, he bursts out in objurgations and reproaches in such force as to overbear his antagonists and fill his hearers with a kind of terror. He seems to have received a special mission to pursue and cover with confusion the innovators who would put the institutions of Methodism in peril. He performs this duty with all the ardor of a forest huntsman, and spares neither bishops, delegates, nor presiding elders, nor ministers, nor laymen. He does terrible execution sometimes, and appears at the tribune of the Conference as intrepid and irresistible as the lion in his own domain. His name alone would draw multitudes to a camp-meeting; and under that voice, powerful, musical, and resonant as a trumpet, and which by turns grows soft or threatening as he deplores the sinner's condition or announces his punishment, the multitude bow their heads, and are swayed like the grass of the prairies beneath the wind."

This account shows us Cartwright as the determined adversary of all innovation; he himself records all the contests in which he has engaged at the General Conferences. Every thing in the Church to which he devoted his life is sacred to him; he is unwilling that its rules and organization be changed, lest by this means its spirit and fruitfulness should suffer. It is not only the ancient rules that he defends, but he regrets also the old times, usages, and manners.

We had no Missionary Society; no Sunday-School Society; no Church papers; no Bible or Tract Societies; no colleges, seminaries, academies, or universities; all the efforts to get up colleges under the patronage of the Methodist Episcopal Church in these United States and Territories were signal failures. We had no pewed churches, no choirs, no organs; in a word, we had no instrumental music in our churches anywhere. The Methodists in that early day dressed plain; attended their meetings faithfully,

especially preaching, prayer and class meetings; they wore no jewelry, no ruffles; they would frequently walk three or four miles to class-meeting, and home again, on Sundays; they would go thirty or forty miles to their quarterly meetings, and think it a glorious privilege to meet their presiding elder, and the rest of the preachers. They could, nearly every soul of them, sing out hymns and spiritual songs. They religiously kept the Sabbath day; many of them abstained from dram-drinking, not because the temperance reformation was ever heard of in that day, but because it was interdicted in the General Rules of our Discipline. The Methodists of that day stood up and faced their preacher when they sung; they kneeled down in the public congregation as well as elsewhere, when the preacher said, "Let us pray." There was no standing among the members in time of prayer, especially the abominable practice of sitting down during that exercise was unknown among early Methodists. Parents did not allow their children to go to balls or plays; they did not send them to dancing-schools; they generally fasted once a week, and almost universally on the Friday before each quarterly meeting. If the Methodists had dressed in the same "superfluity of naughtiness" then as they do now, there were very few even out of the Church that would have any confidence in their religion. But O, how have things changed for the worse in this educational age of the world!

There is no better justification than this of what Horace has said concerning old men, and one could not in higher degree appear as *laudator temporis acti*. It is unreasonable to make the matter of salvation depend on costume, or to see in any particular choice of diet an invincible obstacle to the practice of virtue. Nevertheless, if we are to pardon this hostility to luxury and the refinements of civilization, we may especially do so in a child of the woods, recognizing also that there is in the complaints of Cartwright a basis of truth. Having seen the days of vigor in Methodism, the aged preacher has lived to see the commencement of its decay.

The fecundity of Methodism, as we have striven to show, lies chiefly in its organization, which had for its object to develop and nourish the spirit of propagandism. It called forth unceasingly within the mass of adherents new apostles whose efforts were assured of at least a temporary success, and whose zeal might reanimate the general torpor. There was a constant mutual stimulation on the part of clergy and laity. The system of rotation in circuits was in this respect beneficial, for, by bringing preachers and audience together who had not

had opportunity to familiarize themselves with each other, it demanded unusual effort on the one side, and rendered attention more easy on the other through the incitement of novelty. In fine, the itinerancy of the preachers, the facility of the arrangement for establishing class leaders and exhorters, allowed Methodism to make its influence felt in every place and at all times, and in this view we may say that Wesley bestowed upon Protestantism an element of force, and a lever analogous to that secured by the religious orders in the Catholic Church. Statistics alone can show in full the propagating energy of Methodism and the rapidity of its progress. When the Methodist Church was organized at the Baltimore Conference it counted eighty-six preachers and a little less than fifteen thousand members; in 1843, sixty years later, there were four thousand itinerant preachers, more than one million communicants, and the number of attendants upon its services was reckoned at five millions in addition. While the most prosperous of the other sects had increased simply tenfold, Methodism had grown in the proportion of one to seventy-one. Now, its ratio of increase follows, if it does not surpass, that of the general population.

But in England, Methodism has nearly lost the spirit and propagating energy which Wesley sought to impart to his society. Not only has individual activity declined because of the greater frequency and facility of public effort which has put an end to private assemblies and spontaneous preaching, but a revolution has taken place in the ministry. If in the Catholic Church, despite the obligation to celibacy and the vow of poverty, all the religious orders have fallen into degeneracy, and have only recovered themselves by successive reformatory movements, it is yet more to be expected that the tendency to become stationary, to adopt a more settled life in place of the fatigue and uncertainties of the itinerancy, would prevail with a Protestant clergy who are married, and with whom the cares of a family qualify the force of religious zeal. To-day beside each English church stands the Methodist chapel; in one is a minister, in the other a preacher. The two clergy and the two Churches live the same life, hardly separated by the slightest differences. A like transformation is being accomplished in Canada, where the itinerants are

allowed to remain in each circuit five years, and where the increase of preachers diminishes each year the dimensions of the circuits. The same causes must operate to produce the same effect in the United States.

The change is already sufficiently marked to have attracted the attention of Cartwright. Despite his love and prejudice for his Church, the aged preacher perceives that American Methodism has already undergone profound alterations, and he deplores every change as a prognostic of ruin. Although the Asburys and M'Kendrees, and the founders of the sect generally, were voluntarily given to celibacy, Cartwright, himself married, and conscious of never having neglected his duties as a preacher, cannot see in the marriage of the clergy one of the most active causes of the decadence which threatens his Church. He searches, indeed, in almost every direction for causes of this degeneracy, and readily finds such in what he calls the infatuation of the age for education. It is easy to see that he is no friend to the institutions where they make preachers by the dozen, and he thrusts his sarcasms most heartily at ministers who are too fond of *belles-lettres*. Thus in his preface he expresses the hope that his book will serve a better purpose than to satisfy a vain curiosity, or simply try the fastidious taste of fine-spoken ministers, who, by the fortune of the times and abundance of books, have found advantages for education. Cartwright does not hesitate to say that if the preaching is less effective than formerly it is because the ministers have become so highly educated as to lose their sacred fire and source of inspiration:

> Right here I wish to say, (I hope without the charge of egotism,) when I consider the insurmountable disadvantages and difficulties that the early pioneer Methodist preachers labored under in spreading the Gospel in these Western wilds in the great valley of the Mississippi, and contrast the disabilities which surrounded them on every hand with the glorious human advantages that are enjoyed by their present successors, it is confoundingly miraculous to me that our modern preachers cannot preach better, and do more good than they do. Many nights, in early times, the itinerant had to camp out, without fire or food for man or beast. Our pocket Bible, Hymn Book, and Discipline constituted our library. It is true we could not, many of us, conjugate a verb or parse a sentence, and murdered the king's English almost every lick. But there was a Divine unction attended the word preached, and thousands fell under the mighty power of God, and thus the

Methodist Episcopal Church was planted firmly in this Western wilderness, and many glorious signs have followed, and will follow, to the end of time.

A danger which Cartwright points out with greater reason is the very result of the Church's progress. In proportion as Methodism has increased its numbers and wealth, it has been called upon to satisfy more extensive demands, and has sought to put itself upon a level with other Churches. Therefore it has founded seminaries to instruct its clergy, and colleges to recruit its seminaries; it has established journals for the promotion of its interests and for controversy; it has instituted associations and business enterprises for the publication and spread of its literature. Each of these establishments, which are constantly multiplied, involves the creation of numerous positions which add to the attractions of a settled life the advantage of a comfortable remuneration, and which naturally claim the best talent. Since it were impossible to exclude from the Church men who are an honor to it and its apparent chief strength, these continually multiplying occupants of the local positions are maintained in all the prerogatives of the ministry. Cartwright complains of seeing men vote in the Conferences who have never had charge of a circuit, know nothing of the life and wants of a preacher, and have indeed, perchance, never once preached. He anticipates with dread the day when these dignitaries of settled position shall constitute a majority in the Conferences, and shall give law to the preachers.

Whenever, indeed, this inevitable revolution shall be accomplished, Methodism will be destroyed in its very essence; it will cease to be a militant Church, a nursery of propagandism; nothing will distinguish it from the innumerable sects which spring up around it, and which are constantly enfeebled by the spirit of schism. Cartwright's fears are therefore legitimate; but no one can arrest the course of Methodism in the fatal decline to which the force of circumstances impel it. When a Church has not that immovable basis to which the Roman Church lays claim, it is obliged to be compliant and suit the times, even if it must, in order to live, sacrifice the very sources of its life. Cartwright laments that the camp-meeting scenes of his own triumph are now quite fallen into des-

uetude; but this is a change well enough explained by the very notion he himself gives us of that institution. Many other changes will take place, and will be, like that, the natural result of certain transformations occurring in the United States. The population is denser, and, taking on the milder manners of civilization, it has more regular customs and wants quite different from those of a widely scattered and half-civilized people. Why should you go into the woods to hear preaching which solicits attention just at your door? Why should a well-settled and rich community be compelled to await the return of an evangelist to have its children baptized, its marriages and the sacraments celebrated, when at a little sacrifice it may erect a church in its midst and establish there a pastor well known to all? The Mississippi valley is filled to-day with large towns, some of which have a population above one hundred thousand; with such populous cities new necessities are presented which Methodism must meet, and this Church, having been already, at an early day, established in the new territory, counts now, without doubt, the largest number of its adherents in the towns. A settled population necessarily implies a settled clergy. From this change in circumstances has sprung and proceeds daily the transformation of American Methodism. While the settled institutions of this Church grow, and its ministry becomes to a greater extent educated; while its endowments of all sorts are being multiplied and enriched, its original work of evangelism will by degrees decline and come to occupy a subordinate place, as in the other Churches. Meanwhile the course of emigration still pursues its way toward the Pacific, and the perils and necessities of the pioneers are not less than before. But now upon their track comes the Catholic missionary. Since it set foot in the United States in following the Irish emigration, the Catholic Church has made marvelous progress in the West. It has its regular clergy for the towns, its religious orders for the floating and scattered populations, and, thanks to the twofold militia which it unceasingly recruits in both hemispheres! it will perhaps inherit in the Mississippi valley the place which the Methodist Church has for nearly a century filled.

Art. IV.—THE KU KLUX CONSPIRACY.*

It is generally conceded that the victorious party in our late war acted toward the vanquished with unprecedented generosity. When General Lee tendered his sword under the apple-tree at Appomattox it was with the most serious apprehensions as to himself andthe other rebel leaders. But the first item of General Grant's terms was that all officers should retain their side-arms, implying that the conqueror desired to inflict as little humiliation as possible. But still more generous was the next provision, which declared "that each officer and soldier is permitted to return to his home, there to remain undisturbed so long as he obeys the laws of the land where he resides." Here was complete amnesty to the entire army; and afterward, when President Andrew Johnson was seized with his spasm to make treason odious, and proposed to try General Lee for levying war against the nation, General Grant interposed a negative on the ground that he was a paroled soldier, and his parole could not be broken.

Then, after the terms were signed, and General Lee, remembering that many of his artillery horses belonged to the men, and that it would be a great hardship to surrender them, came hesitatingly to represent the case to General Grant, saying, "But it is too late; the papers are signed. General Grant said, "No matter about the papers;" and at once wrote the order for retaining the horses, "because," said he, "they will need them for the spring plowing."

Since the close of the war no man's property has been confiscated on account of his connection with the rebellion, and no man has been executed for treason. Nor has Congress ever hesitated to grant amnesty whenever it has been asked. It has not only freely granted all such requests, but has also passed a general bill relieving all persons from their disabilities except members of the Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh Congresses, the cabinet ministers of that period, judges of the United States

* Report of the Joint Select Committee appointed to inquire into the condition of affairs in the late Insurrectionary States so far as regards the execution of the laws, and the safety of the lives and property of the citizens of the United States. Senate of the United States, February 19, 1872.

Courts, and the officers of our army and navy who went into the rebellion. Probably, in all, not over two hundred persons.

Nor is it easy to see that there are any reasonable grounds of complaint against the victors on account of their terms of reconstruction. The war had emancipated the slaves, and the people had, by the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, made them citizens. They were consequently entitled to the ordinary rights of citizens; and when we demanded, as one of the conditions of self-government, that they should make all their citizens equal before the law, and give them equal political rights, we required only what had been conceded in all the free States, and what was set forth in our great Declaration of Independence as the basis of all just and equitable government, namely, that the newly-organized States should "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

But however reasonable this requirement may have been, it was so directly against Southern pride and Southern prejudice as to be well-nigh intolerable. Under the old order government embraced the white population only, and the rights of the slaves were wholly disregarded. They had no voice in public affairs, nor even in their own affairs, and no independent power in the case "of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness."

But when society was reorganized on the basis of the reconstruction acts, and governments were established which recognized the late slaves as citizens and voters, while, at the same time, a considerable portion of the old ruling class were disfranchised on account of their participation in the rebellion, the effect was to turn society "bottom upward," and to put the government in the hands of the emancipated slaves.

But these new citizens were ignorant and incapable, and must, in the nature of things, lean on others; and as men from the North had fought for and achieved their emancipation, and were engaged in establishing schools among them, and in looking after their improvement, they turned from their old masters and took counsel and direction from the Northern men who had come among them since the war. Hence arose the power and consideration of that much-abused class of persons known as Carpet-baggers. Many of them were undoubtedly narrow enough, and selfish enough; but a still greater evil was the prejudice which they fostered between the freedmen and the old

ruling class. The effect of their intercourse with the negroes was to encourage them to lay aside their demeanor of deference, and to come forward and claim a share of the honors and offices hitherto enjoyed only by the white race.

This was a state of things deeply mortifying to Southern pride, and against which it strongly revolted. "Nigger" had always been an expression of supremest contempt. As a slave the negro "had no rights which a white man was bound to respect." Emancipated, it was supposed that in time he might grow into some intelligence and consideration. But to make him an equal at once, to put him in positions of honor and profit, to have him in the seats of authority, laying down the law to the white man, touched Southern pride to the quick, and aroused the most intense feeling of disgust.

But what, more than any thing else, intensified this feeling, was the fact that while the planters had no influence whatever with the new voters, the adventurers from the North, whom they so heartily despised—schoolmasters, ministers, agents of the Freedmen's Bureau, little traders who had come among them to "turn an honest penny"—not only controlled them, but so controlled them as to make them a political power directly antagonistic to their old masters.

For this state of things there seemed to be no remedy. In most of the States the negroes and the few white men who acted with them constituted the voting majority; and hence they had more or less power over both legislation and administration. The negro could not, therefore, be taught "to know his place" by any process of court procedure. The law was what he appealed to. The law was on his side. Still it was clear enough that he was all wrong; that he was getting impudent and above his condition; that he had lost his deference for the old master race, and that society needed some correction outside of the law to bring it back to a tolerable condition.

With a knowledge of this state of facts it will be easy to understand why the Ku-Klux idea took such instant and deep hold of the Southern mind. The best classes of persons saw in it exactly what was needed to correct what they regarded as the abuses of the reconstruction acts. Through it they could punish negro impudence and negro ambition, and teach their old slaves to know their place. They could also administer a

wholesome check to carpet-bag assumptions, and let these radicals understand that they must return the ruling power to the ruling class, who were entitled to it by nativity, education, intelligence, and experience. These were objects which in their view needed to be accomplished, and the Ku-Klux Klan promised to accomplish them. No doubt there were excesses which the better classes did not approve; but they sympathized so strongly with the objects to be attained, that these excesses were either overlooked, or approved as necessary evils which the correction of society amply justified.

In the laborious investigation instituted by Congress, embracing a vast amount of testimony, taken largely on the spot, and printed in thirteen ponderous volumes, it is apparent throughout that this great conspiracy had the countenance and support of the old ruling class. On this point the evidence is abundant, and is fairly epitomized by General Butler, of South Carolina, when he says: "Until influential men, men who have the right to express an opinion, are allowed to utter a voice, I, for one, do not intend to raise my hand against it. I say, As long as you don't touch my house, shoot and kill as many as you please; and that is the feeling all over the State."

Here is the philosophy of this terrible scourge in a few words. In ordinary cases of wrong-doing society feels that it is injured, and that it must protect itself and punish the wrong-doer. But in the case of these crimes, as they were in the interest of the old master class, they were not against society, as that word was understood by them; and men in high position, like General Butler, regarded the Klân as doing their work, and so shut their eyes and stood aloof, giving the murderers the full benefit of their silent approbation.

General Butler also revealed the feeling of his class toward the freedmen on account of their persistent adherence to the Republican party. He said if the negroes had been let alone they would have attached themselves to their old masters, and been governed by their counsel and advice, and would have voted with them in the elections. The following, on this point, is taken from his testimony:

Question. Then the effect of the relation of master and slave having formerly existed does not prevent the master from acquiring ascendency over the negro?

Answer. I do not think it does. I think if the master would become a radical he would go for him right off.

Q. You do not say that the former relation of master and slave deprives the native South Carolinian of an influence over the former slave?

A. Not at all.

Q. Have you no idea that the negro is led to that party by his conscientious belief?

A. No, sir. . . . I think it has been drilled into him that the Republican party freed him; that they came here with banners flying and emancipated him. I think all this sort of falsehood has been drilled into him. . . . If a man is a Republican, that is enough, if he is from the penitentiary; but if he is a Democrat, they will have nothing to do with him, whoever he is.

The intensity of this feeling in regard to the negro will explain much that follows. It reveals the true cause of that general hatred of the Republican party which brought the whole force of the Ku-Klux organization against it. The white portion of the Republican party was even more hateful to the planter class than the negroes; because the effect of their intercourse with the negroes was to "set them up," to make them independent, or, in the language of the South, "impudent," and to cause them to lay aside their habits of deference and servility. The Northern portion were "carpet-baggers," and the Southern "scallawags," and both shared alike the general feeling of dislike and disgust.

When it is said that the operations of the Ku-Klux Klans were not against the government, and were not intended to further the objects of separation and independence, as in the late rebellion, the statement is probably true. Although the evidence shows pretty conclusively that the order existed in all the Southern States, that it was in its general aspects military, that it had a general head in the nation, a commander in each State, a sub-commander in each county, and captains over camps or dens, it fails to show any purpose to strike at the government in any other sense than to control and bring into contempt the execution of the reconstruction acts.

In stating the purposes of the order the witnesses all had before their vision Article VIII of the prescript, which swears them not to reveal to any one not a member "any of the secrets, signs, grips, pass-words, mysteries, or *purposes*" of the order, and their statements are consequently divergent and contradic-

tory. But although its purposes are more surely gathered from its conduct than in any other way, there are not wanting very satisfactory statements on this head; and that of James E. Boyd is so important that he must be permitted to speak for himself. He is a respectable lawyer of Graham, Allemance County, North Carolina, and canvassed his county for the Legislature. He was born in the county, and has resided in the town of Graham for sixteen years. The following is condensed from his testimony:

Question. What knowledge have you of secret political organizations in your county?

Answer. I know of three political organizations that have existed in Allemance County. The Union League was a Republican organization. I was not a member. Another was the White Brotherhood. I joined it, in the town of Graham, in November, 1868. I was not initiated in a regular camp, as it was called, but in the room of the chief.

Q. Can you give us in detail what the regulations were?

A. The meetings were to be held in secret places—in the woods or some place distant from any habitation, in order to avoid detection. The disguise prescribed was a long white gown, and a mask for the face. No applicant could be admitted till his name had been first submitted to a regular camp. A county was divided into a certain number of districts, and each district composed a camp, which was under the command of a captain. The whole county constituted a Klan, under the command of a chief. No raid was to be made, no person punished, no execution done unless first unanimously agreed upon at a regular meeting of a camp of the Klan and duly approved by the officers and the chief of the Klan. The sign of membership was sliding the right hand down along the opposite lappel of the coat, and the recognition was in the same manner with the left hand. The word for distress was "Shiloh." There was also a sign of distress made by the hand. When a raid was ordered the plan of operation was this: If the person to be punished lived in our vicinity the persons to execute the punishment came from a distant camp, in order the better to avoid detection. When on a raid only one person was allowed to speak, and that one was designated who could best disguise his voice.

Q. Are the members bound to carry out the decrees of the order if they involve murder and assassination?

A. I think so, sir. If it was decided to take the life of a man, a camp is ordered to execute the sentence, and is bound to do it.

Q. If arrests were made by the civil authorities for murder or other crime committed in pursuance of the decrees of a camp, to what extent did the obligations of members bind them to arrest and protect each other?

A. To whatever extent was in their power.

Q. Did it go to the extent of giving testimony in behalf of each other, or of acquitting if upon a jury?

A. I think that was one of the objects; that a person on the witness stand or in the jury box should disregard his oath in order to protect a member.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the number of persons in your county belonging to the organization?

A. Between six and seven hundred, I should suppose. There are, I believe, ten camps in the county, and the camps will average from fifty to seventy-five members each.

Q. What is the population?

A. About four thousand. The voting population is about eighteen or nineteen hundred, and the whites twelve or thirteen hundred.

Q. Then with about eighteen hundred voters in your county you think that six or seven hundred are members of this organization?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your knowledge of the object and extent of this organization throughout the State?

A. I can only state from hearsay. The number is supposed to be forty thousand. The object was the overthrow of the reconstruction policy of Congress, and the disfranchisement of the negro.

Q. What extent of means was to be used to influence elections?

A. We can only judge of that by the manner in which it has operated to influence elections, by riding around in the night time, disguised, to the houses of poor white men and negroes, and informing them that if they went to the election such and such would be their fate—proceedings of that kind; and by whipping, and at the same time informing them that a part, at least, of their offense was having voted the Republican ticket.

Q. State whether instances of that character were frequent in the State?

A. The instances have been very common.

Q. What are the means adopted to deny connection with this Order?

A. In the explanation given by the person initiating it was stated that the organization was known to the public as Ku-Klux, but that the proper name was White Brotherhood; and this difference was made so that when a person who was really a member of the White Brotherhood was put upon the witness stand and asked if he was a member of the Ku-Klux he could safely swear he was not.

Q. For what were the victims punished?

A. I do not know; just whatever they saw proper. If they thought the man ought to be killed for being too prominent in politics, they would have a meeting and pass sentence upon him. I have no doubt, though I have no information from others to that

effect, that Outlaw was killed to break up the organization of colored voters in my county or frighten them away from voting.

Q. Were other punishments ever inflicted in your county besides this?

A. Yes, sir. In consequence of Outlaw's murder a negro by the name of William Puryear, a half-simple fellow, who, it was said, saw some of his neighbors returning in disguise from Graham, the night Outlaw was hung, was drowned in the mill-pond.

Q. Were there any whippings in the county?

A. Yes, sir. I believe there were one hundred, or one hundred and fifty, in the last two years, white and black. Some have been whipped two or three times.

Q. Do you know when this organization first started in North Carolina?

A. No, sir. My first knowledge of it was during the Presidential canvass of 1868. I canvassed my county on the Seymour and Blair ticket, and went into the county of Randolph and made a speech at Liberty. There a gentleman from Guilford County, by the name of Higgins, came up to me and said, *that was his business;* and I, being a strong Democrat, and of course favorable to the cause, he had no delicacy in approaching me about it.

Q. Was the order made use of to advance the Democratic party?

A. O yes; undoubtedly.

Q. Was there any understanding that the organization in your county was connected with the State organization?

A. O yes, sir; that was understood, that it was connected not only throughout the State, but throughout the United States.

Q. Were those outrages, whippings, etc., more frequent after the organization started in your county?

A. We never had any before.

Q. The violence that took place, then, was not from individual and irresponsible men, but by order of the organization?

A. My impression is this: The organization did not remain in its original purity. I do not think, in many instances, they ever took the trouble to carry proceedings through the regular channels. They just gathered in neighborhoods in camp and agreed together to execute a decree; a member from another camp would come and tell his friends that there was such a person needed some attention, and they would go out and attend to his case. That was in order to prove an alibi. The man who was whipped or injured would generally suspect some person who lived in the neighborhood. That is the great reason that none of them have been caught or arrested.

Q. Was there any reference to the Constitution of the United States in any of the oaths?

A. In the Constitution Union Guards, not in the oath, but in the explanation of the object, it was stated to be the re-establishment of the Constitution as it was, without the amendments.

This must suffice as to the general character and purposes

of this organization; but it should be understood that different witnesses presented it in different aspects. Another distinguished witness, David Schenck, Esq., a member of the bar of Lincoln County, who was initiated in Gascon County in October, 1868, and says he is ashamed of his connection with the order, represents it as a secret political association, on the basis of the Seymour and Blair platform, for furthering the success of the Democratic party. He does not think that there was any "uniformity of understanding about it, or that there was any connecting system between the different counties," and declares his belief that the original purpose was not improper. He says:

> The obligation, as repeated to me, was simply a declaration of those principles which I openly espoused, and I honestly thought then, and do now, that the original purpose of those who initiated me was to promote party interests in a lawful way; but it either became perverted, or they were mistaken in its objects, for it degenerated into a mob of rioters and marauders, who plundered and abused friend and foe alike.

Mr. Schenck says he soon became satisfied of the pernicious tendency and character of the Order, but that he was afraid to denounce it, and should have felt that his life was in danger if he had taken open ground against it.

As Mr. Schenck was called by the Democratic side of the Committee, and was evidently disposed to put as mild a face on the doings of the order as possible, there is one portion of his testimony which will be of great interest to the public every-where. He tells us that, notwithstanding the fearful state of society which this organization produced, it was effectually broken up by the Federal prosecutions, and that the Raleigh trials were fairly conducted; that Judge Bond is an able lawyer, an upright man, and an excellent judge; that the juries acted fairly and rendered just verdicts; and that the defendants were properly punished. (Pages 389 and 394).

It will be remembered that, at the term of the United States Circuit Court, held at Raleigh, under what is known as the Ku-Klux Act, Judge Bond presided, and that true bills of indictment were found against seven hundred and sixty-three persons for offenses under that act. Of these, sixty were tried, and twenty-four convicted; and there were twenty-three

who pleaded guilty, and thirteen who were acquitted. It was at these trials that Hon. Reverdy Johnson and Hon. Henry Stanbury appeared as counsel for the defendants, and that the former, in his surprise and indignation at the unexpected revelations, said:

> I have listened with unmixed horror to some of the testimony which has been brought before you. The outrages *proved* are shocking to humanity; they admit of neither excuse nor justification; they violate every obligation which law and nature imposes upon men.

It is evident, as this witness testifies, that many of the proceedings were irregular, and without much regard to Klan authority. It is also probable that individuals and small parties of vicious persons, finding that their acts would be attributed to the Ku-Klux, took advantage of the unsettled state of society thus existing and committed outrages against obnoxious persons which were popularly regarded as the doings of the order. The whipping or shooting of a negro in such a state of society was of little account. Ex-Governor Parsons, of Alabama, says in his testimony: "I have never known an instance in which a man has been convicted of killing a negro."

Hence, if we would get a correct idea of the operations of this order we must follow it through the various States in its raids against persons of some standing and distinction. The testimony of individuals may be warped by the circumstances under which they act; but if we find the same influences and the same machinery in widely sundered States, we may safely conclude that there is unity of organization and unity of purpose.

In North Carolina one of the most characteristic raids was that against James M. Justice. It shows that the organization was not confined to the county where he resided; that it was under the direction of the better classes of society; that it was admirable in its discipline, and totally regardless of the civil authorities. Mr. Justice is a native of the State, a lawyer of large practice, a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives, and had been canvassing his county against the proposed constitutional convention, which was a democratic measure. He had had no fear of personal danger, and in his speeches was severe against the Ku-Klux; and had also been

counsel against some members who had been arrested and were held for trial.

His residence was in the village of Rutherfordton, where it was easy to give an alarm which could not fail to reach the ears of the surrounding shop-keepers and mechanics, and which might be expected to bring prompt and effective succor. But neither his position in society, nor his location in a village where he had many relatives and friends, was sufficient to save him from their clutches. On a Sunday night, about twelve o'clock, he was awakened out of a sound sleep by a violent crash at the front door, which was split or broken through with an ax. He knew what was coming, but no time was left him for action; for in a moment there was firing in all directions through the house, and his room was filled with armed men. A match was struck, and the light showed that they were in all sorts of disguises. "Some had very long white beards; some had horns which were erect; others had horns which lapped over like a mule's ears, and their caps ran up to a point, with tassels."

Two of them rushed forward to the bed and said, "You d—d rascal, come out," and they seized him and dragged him forward toward the door. He plead with them to let him alone, but they replied, "Don't say a word, your time has come." He then commenced screaming to raise an alarm, which was answered by a blow on the head with a pistol, which knocked him down, and which admonished him that it was best to keep silence.

On reaching the street he found that it was raining hard; and, as he was without shoes or stockings, or any clothing other than his night shirt, and his wound was bleeding badly, he began to suffer greatly and to feel faint. On reaching the outskirts of the village he complained that the gravel hurt his feet, and one of his attendants said in reply that "it would make no difference, he would not need his feet long." When his faintness overcame him and he asked to sit down, one of them charged him with "putting it on." He said no, his wound was bleeding and he was very weak. He was told in reply that "it was d—d nigger equality blood that was running out, and that it would do him good."

The party was large, but they had other work on hand, and

the larger portion broke off to destroy the office of the Republican paper, (the *Star*,) which was thoroughly broken up, but which Mr. Justice did not see done. After the division the smaller party, which had Mr. Justice in charge, became talkative, and asked him many questions, which he answered, and which he was able to answer, skillfully and well. On one occasion what they charged against him he shifted over on the government, and one of them said, "D—n such a government! that would put ignorant negroes over us to control white men. You have advocated this and you cannot deny it. You know a negro is not fit to rule over white men."

The conversation went on, and Mr. Justice had the idea that it was making an impression in his favor. We quote in his own words:

> One said, "What kind of cases have you been having lately?" I said, "Almost all kinds—from murder down to assault and battery. We have been trying some cases against the Ku-Klux." "Yes," said he, "you are very fond of that kind of practice." I said "No, not especially so; but I was appointed by the commissioner to discharge a duty of that kind, and I have attempted to do it as I understand it to be right." "Yes," said he, "we know something about that; and you have been making some very strong speeches lately; you are in favor of hanging our leaders. Our party proposes to rid this country of this damned, infamous nigger government, and you propose to defeat us by hanging our leaders, you damned rascal; you are in favor of hanging leaders and letting the plow-boys go. Now, you are a leader on the other side, and what objection can you make to being hung, as you advocate the doctrine of hanging leaders." Well, I thought he was getting in on me pretty close, sure enough. I knew from that they had heard what I had said; but I replied that I had never advised anybody to do wrong, whether I was a leader or not. They said, "You have done some good things, which we appreciate; you had Carson discharged when he was wrongfully arrested."

The reply was that, although Mr. Justice had done some good things, he was working against them, and they were going to kill him. But the chief, who was in command of the party, and said he was from another county, seemed to lend a favorable ear to the conversation. He appeared to be much interested in finding a man by the name of Biggerstaff, who had been twice whipped, but who had escaped from a party just as they were about to hang him, and who, it would seem, was

under sentence of death. Mr. Justice had a long talk with this little chief, as he calls him, and the result was that the little chief announced his determination to save his life on the condition that he would meet him at an appointed place on the next Saturday night, and give information as to where Biggerstaff could be found, and that he would cease taking any further part in the canvass, and would pledge himself to be a true friend to the South. Mr. Justice says:

They were loud and clamorous in their protestations against letting me go, and declared that I must be killed. This chief man placed four men in a circle right around me and said, "Don't shoot here; you will shoot friends." He then talked with me again about Biggerstaff, and asked if I could not go and find him. Said he, "Our friends have had him twice, and he has promised us both times that he would not tell, and said that he did not know us, and both times he has gone right off, as soon as he could get to the officers, and sworn against us and brought us into trouble." And then he said to me, "Do you know that our camps have lately all been assembled, and that we have taken a fresh oath to the effect that we will kill every man who swears against us in the United States Courts?" I said that I did not know that. He said, "It is a matter of fact. Now Biggerstaff has testified so, not only once, but twice, and he has got some of our friends into a heap of trouble, and we will have to kill him. If he leaves this State and goes to another State, all we have to do is to send a decree to another camp there, and they will kill him. And you may as well show us where he is, so that we can kill him, for we are bound to kill him anyhow."

When the decree had gone forth to spare the life of Mr. Justice, the little chief, who, Mr. Justice says, was a very intelligent man, explained his action thus:

After the men had all gone out of sight, the chief said to me, "These fellows want to kill you very badly, but I want to save you if I can. I have an absolute order to take your life to-night. But I will tell you something about our rules. We may be ordered to go and whip a man, to give him a certain number of lashes, and he may behave in such a way as to justify our taking his life. Then we may be ordered to take a man's life, but if he behaves so as to justify us we may spare him. I think you ought to be spared, and I want to do it, and I will do it if I can control these men, though they seem to be very ambitious toward you, and I think entirely too much so. You know most of these men, I think, if you could see their faces, for they are men you are acquainted with. But you don't know me; you never saw me until to-night; I have heard of you, and my friends know you well. I think from the talk I have had with you to-night that they are

mistaken about you. If you will stop supporting the damned radical party I think you will be all right, and I should like to know you in our order."

Mr. Justice the next day received an order to go to Washington to give testimony before the committee, and so failed to keep his appointment with the chief. Mr. Justice thinks that there have been more than a hundred raids in his county, and at each raid a number of outrages, mostly whippings, but some murders; and he mentions the burning of two colored schoolhouses and one colored church.

In South Carolina one of the witnesses, William K. Owens, gives the particulars of his initiation into the Order in 1870, and discloses what was the oath, the signs, the pass-words, etc. He says that the members were bound to obey all the orders of their chief, and that if murder was decreed, the penalty of any disobedience was death; that they were to deny their membership, and to clear each other as jurors or as witnesses; that the Order has an existence in all parts of the State; that he has recognized members in several different counties, and in North Carolina; that several murders were committed in York, where he resided, and that he was on a raid to arrest and murder the treasurer of the county, who, however, escaped; he gives the names of the chiefs and members in the town of York, and states that it was a part of their business to disarm negroes; that the object was political, "to carry the negro for the democratic party."

The effect which the operations of the Order had on political affairs may be inferred from what took place in the county of Spartanburg, where the Democratic county paper published forty-five renunciations like the following:

> Mr. Editor: I desire to make this public announcement of my withdrawal from all affiliation with the Republican party, with which I have heretofore acted. I am prompted to take this step from the conviction that the policy of said party, in encouraging fraud, bribery, and excessive taxation, is calculated to ruin the country.

One of these notices, signed by Samuel T. White, has a little history connected with it which will explain the appearance of the others. He was before the Committee, is a respectable white man, a carpenter, forty-four years of age, and a native of the county. At night, when he was asleep in his house, he was

awakened by a crowd, who were clamoring to have the door opened. He says:

After I got up the light I walked to the front door and opened it, and the men there hallooed to the others at the back door to stop lamming, and they stopped. They then ordered me to cross my hands; I did so. They asked for a rope; I told them there was none. I reckon one of them went up the stairs with a light to get a piece of rope—an old bed-cord or something, and they took a pillow-slip and slipped it over my head and led me into the yard. They asked me my principles, and I told them. They said, "That was what I thought you were."

They asked if I was a Union man or a Democrat. I told them I had always been a Union man. They said they thought so. They carried me off seventy-five or eighty yards from the house. They said, "Here is a limb," and they asked me whether I would rather be shot, hung, or whipped. I told them if it had to be one, I would have to take a whipping. They ordered me to run; I told them I did not wish to do that. Then they commenced on me.

Question. What did they do?

Answer. They whipped me.

Q. How?

A. They took little hickories and one thing or another.

Q. Was the whipping a severe one?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many men were there?

A. I can't say as to that; I thought, from the number around the house, there were twenty or thirty.

Q. How were they dressed?

A. They were disguised.

Q. How were they disguised?

A. With horns and every thing over their faces.

Q. Could you tell who any of them were?

A. No, sir.

Q. What was done after they were through whipping you?

A. They just untied my hands, got on their horses, and went out.

Q. Did they leave you there?

A. Yes, sir. They told me I must publish my principles.

Q. Would you have published any card of this kind if these men had not required it?

A. No, sir.

Some of the other parties were examined to the same effect, and in one case the requirement was still more humiliating. Mr. John Genobles, a white man, sixty-nine years of age, who had been in the county over forty years, after being dragged from his bed and severely beaten with hickories, was let off

from further punishment on a promise that he would go to the court-house steps and publicly declare himself to be a Democrat, and if he failed to do it he was to be killed. Of course, after such a warning, he fulfilled his promise.

Dr. John Winsmith was a native of Spartanburg, and had resided there since his birth, sixty-eight years. He was a planter and a practicing physician, and was for fifteen years a member of the State Legislature. He is a man of high character and of large acquaintance; but he made up his mind to vote for Governor Scott, and it was reported, as he says, falsely, that he had procured arms and put them into the hands of his negroes. Nothing had occurred to awaken any suspicions on his part, and when he was aroused in the night (March 22, 1871) by strange noises about his yard, he got up and went to the back door, and saw two men, who immediately called out to another portion of the party who were at the front door, "Come around here, boys, here's the d—d rascal!" The doctor then suspected the facts, and, having a couple of pistols where he could lay his hands on them, he fell back for a moment and then reappeared and fired. The men ran, and he followed them around to the front, when he heard noises which indicated a large company. He was met by a volley of balls, and was struck in seven different places; but he used his pistols with so much effect that they fled. He sank down in the yard faint and exhausted with the loss of blood, and for some time his life was despaired of; but he ultimately recovered. They were disguised, and were about thirty in number.

William M. Champion, another Spartanburg man who was whipped a hundred lashes, when asked what it was done for said, all he could hear was that he "was a d—d old radical son of a b—h." When asked what was the effect of these doings on society, he said: "It has thrown us into the woods at night, and we are afraid to be out in the day-time. I have never laid in my bed from the time I was whipped till now."

The awful condition of such a society cannot well be imagined. Hundreds of people slept in the woods for months together, and a feeling of alarm seized all classes of persons, but was general among the negroes. A list was exhibited to the Committee in the examination of P. Q. Camp, Esq., and Rev. Dr. Cummings, particularizing two hundred and twenty-seven

cases of outrage, one hundred and eighteen being in one township, and four of them resulting in death. But the Deputy United States Marshal, C. L. Casy, Esq., says that the list does not cover half the cases, and that the whippings must have reached nearly five hundred. The apprehension was so general that many houses were entirely deserted at night, and the women and children took their blankets and repaired regularly to the woods. In his testimony he says:

> A good many in the country told me they were sleeping out, and afraid to stay at home; and I know of men in the lower portion of the county sleeping out that have not slept in their houses since the election last November—in fact, the times have been so here in town that about six or eight of us could not stay at our own houses. We had to club together and lie out every night, first at one place and then at another.

In Union County the county officers all had notices from the Ku-Klux that they must resign, and, understanding too well what would be the result if they did not comply, they sent in their resignations. Of course the state of things was not so bad in all the counties, and hence it was that when the President issued his proclamation, in 1871, suspending the privileges of the writ, he only included the counties which were most infested by these devils in disguise. At the subsequent term of the Circuit Court held under the Ku-Klux Act at Columbus, there were seven hundred and eighty-five indictments. About fifty pleaded guilty, and five were convicted on trial. The Grand Jury in their presentation say: "They have been as much appalled by the number of outrages as at their character, it appearing that eleven murders and over six hundred whippings have been committed in York County alone."

Among the Ku-Klux cases in Alabama there is one which shows how, in some cases, they completely overawed and controlled the courts. In the county of Greene a man named Snoddy had been killed, and three negroes were arrested and thrown into prison, on a charge of having committed the murder. One of them, by the name of Colvin, was, on the preliminary examination, discharged; and he was soon after visited by a band of disguised men and put to death. Alexander Boyd, the prosecuting attorney, whose duty it was to bring the murderers of Colvin to an account, undertook the work, and said he knew the persons who had hung Colvin, and intended

to keep the jury in session six months but he would get them indicted.

He was a single man, and had his home at the hotel on the public square at Eutaw, a village of two thousand inhabitants, and was apparently safe from any danger of a midnight attack. But about eleven o'clock at night, on the 31st of March, 1870, a band of twenty-five disguised men rode into the town, formed in front of the hotel, and then sent a deputation from their number inside to compel the clerk to show them to the room of Mr. Boyd; and, having found their victim, they put two balls through his head, and left him deliberately, assured that there would be no danger of prosecutions henceforth from that quarter. Of course courts and court officers drew the inference that it was rather a dangerous thing to interfere with the Ku-Klux, and became increasingly cautious. Boyd was buried the next day. No arrests were made, no meeting of the bar was called, and not a member attended his funeral. At the next term of the court the Grand Jury reported that they were unable to identify any body connected with the murder, but that the party was traced on their way home to Pickens County.

There is another aspect in which these Ku-Klux operations present themselves, and which was particularly noticeable in Alabama. We refer to their interference in matters of education and religion. From the testimony of Mr. Speed, a regent of the Alabama State University, it appears that the Faculty of that institution was not to the liking of the order, and that they determined to break it up. Mr. Speed is a Southern man, and went to Tuscaloosa to take part in reorganizing the University. While there he was handed a number of Ku-Kux notices to the students, which were hung on a dagger, and the dagger stuck in one of the doors of the University. The following is a copy of one of these notices, directed to a student by the name of Harton. It was signed, "By order of the K. K. K:"

HARTON: They say you are of good Democratic family. If you are, leave the University, and that quick. We don't intend that the concern shall run any longer. This is the second notice you have received; you will get no other. In less than ten days we intend to clean out the concern. We *will* have good Southern men there or none.

The students thus notified were alarmed, and within the time named left for their homes. One of the reasons for this hostility toward the University was, probably, the election, in 1868, of the Rev. A. S. Lakin as its president, who held his relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church, as contradistinguished from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and was therefore an offense to the old Southern master-race. Mr. Lakin was sent South by the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to organize Churches in its interest, and, beginning his work in the latter part of 1865, had been wonderfully successful. The loyal element naturally gravitated toward him, and the Churches which he formed consequently became the particular object of Ku-Klux hatred. Mr. Lakin, in his testimony, shows some of the obstacles which he and his devoted band of ministers were called to encounter.

Rev. Mr. Sullivan was severely whipped, and while they were inflicting their punishment they warned him that they were bound to kill his Presiding Elder, Mr. Lakin, and that he must preach for the Methodist Church, South, as they were determined that there should be no Methodist Church south of Mason's and Dixon's line but the Church South. Rev. J. A. McCutchen, Presiding Elder, was driven from the Demopolis District in 1868. Rev. James Buchanan was driven from his station. Rev. John W. Tailly, Presiding Elder, was also driven away. Rev. Jesse Kingston was shot. Rev. Mr. Johnson was shot in his pulpit. Rev. James Dorman was whipped in 1869, and driven away in 1870. Rev. Mr. Dean was whipped, and left for dead, having had both of his arms broken. Rev. George Taylor was whipped. And a colored preacher and his son were murdered.

He tells us that in his district six churches were burned by incendiaries, four of them within six weeks of the election, (1870), and that a great many school-houses suffered the same fate. He kept a memorandum of the outrages committed in his district, and his notes include thirty-five murders and three hundred and seventy-one whippings.

In Mississippi the schools were even more the subject of Ku-Klux attention than in Alabama. In Pontotoc County, where the white population largely predominate, there were fifty-two white and twelve colored schools, and the teachers of both

were mostly from the South, and only about one tenth of them were Republicans; but in April, 1871, the teachers of the colored schools were generally called on by the Ku-Klux, and warned that if they did not stop teaching they would be dealt with. One of them disregarded the call and received a second warning, and was generally believed to have been whipped; but whether this was so or not, he abandoned his school.

The breaking up of these schools was not on account of the political predilections of the teachers, for it was ascertained that all but one were Democrats. Col. Flourney, the superintendent, was called on by the Ku-Klux, but was warned of his danger and met them with arms, and one of them was mortally wounded.

Col. A. P. Huggins had been an officer in the Union army, and went into Mississippi to reside in 1865. He at first rented a plantation in Monroe County, which he cultivated till 1867, when he became an officer of the Freedman's Bureau and removed to Jackson. In 1869 he went back to Monroe, and was appointed Assistant Assessor of Internal Revenue; and the next year was made County Superintendent of Schools.

On the 8th of March (1870) he went into the country some eight or ten miles from Aberdeen, the county town, and was engaged during the day in visiting schools, and on the following day, after attending to his duties as assessor and visiting more schools, he went by invitation to spend the night with a Mr. Ross. That night Mr. Huggins was called on in a very civil way by a well-disciplined company of Ku-Klux, numbering one hundred and twenty persons; and he and Mr. Ross, at the bidding of a deputation, went out into the yard to answer the summons of the chief. What then occurred we leave him to tell in his own words:

> When I got down to the fence I asked the chief if he would now state my little bit of warning. He said the decree of the camp was that I should leave the county and State in ten days. He told me that the rule of the camp was, 1. To give the warning; 2. To enforce obedience to their laws by whipping; 3. To kill by the Klan; 4. If that was not done, and obedience was still refused, to kill privately by assassination or otherwise. They said that I was collecting obnoxious taxes from Southern gentlemen to keep d—d old radicals in office; that they wanted me to understand that no laws should be enforced there that they did not make themselves; that they did not like my general radical

ways. I asked them if their operations were against the radical party; they said they were; that they had suffered and endured the radical sway as long as they could; that the radicals had oppressed them with taxation; that they were oppressing them all the time, and that I was the instrument of collecting the taxes; that they had stood it just as long as they could, and that this was their way of getting rid of it; that they were bound to rid themselves of radicals, if it took the killing of them, or something to that effect. There was a colored school and a white school in the neighborhood. I knew most of the men there were from that neighborhood; I asked them with reference to Mr. Davis's school; that was the white school, where I supposed the most of their children were attending; I asked them if they were not satisfied with his school. They said, "No;" that they liked Davis well enough as a teacher, but that they were opposed to the free-school system entirely; that the whites could do as they had always done before; that they could educate their own children; that so far as the negroes were concerned they did not need educating, only to work. They said they had no objection to Davis at all, but that they could manage their own affairs without the State or the United States sending such as I was there to educate their children, and at the same time to educate the negroes too. After the conversation on the school subject closed, one of them said, "Well, sir, what do you say to our warning? Will you leave?" I told them I should leave Monroe County at my pleasure, and not untill I got ready. The captain then said to me, "Sir, you say you will not leave; you will not obey our warning?" I said I would not obey; that I would leave when I got ready, and not before; that I would not be driven from any place. The gate was then thrown open, and the fence was climbed by twenty men in a moment. I was surrounded and disarmed; the pistol that I had had until that time was taken away. They then took me between an eighth and a quarter of a mile down the rond, and came to a hill, where they stopped; they then asked me if I was still of the same opinion—that I would not leave the county; I told them I was; that I would not leave. They said they should hate very much to interfere with me; that they had made promises to Mr. Ross and myself; that I had really not been obnoxious to them only in the tax line, and that they would not like to interfere with me, for they counted me as a gentleman; that all they wanted was to get rid of me from the county and from the State; that I could not stay there. They said that if I would promise them, I should go back to my bed and sleep quietly, and they would all go on home; they really urged in every way that it was possible for men to do to get me to promise to leave the county and the State without any violence. They then showed me a rope with a noose, and said that was for such as myself who were stubborn; that if I did not consent to leave I should die; that dead men tell no tales. At this time I saw a man coming from toward the horses; he had a stirrup-strap some inch and a quarter in width, and at least an

eighth of an inch thick; it was very stout leather; the stirrup was a wooden one. As he came up he threw down the wooden stirrup and came on toward me, and I saw that he was intending to hit me with the strap; that that was the weapon they intended to use first. He came on, and without further ceremony at all—I was in my shirt-sleeves—he struck me two blows, calling out, "One, two," and said, "Now, boys, count." They counted every lash they gave me. The first man gave me ten blows himself, standing on my left side, striking over my left arm and on my back; the next one gave me five blows. Then a fresh hand took it and gave me ten blows; that made twenty-five. They then stopped, and asked me again if I would leave the county. I still refused, and told them that now they had commenced they could go just as far as they pleased; that all had been done that I cared for; that I would as soon die then as to take what I had taken. They continued to strike their blows on my back in the same way until they had reached fifty. None of them struck more than ten blows, some of them only three, and some as low as two. They said they all wanted to get a chance at me; that I was stubborn and just such a man as they liked to pound. When they had struck me fifty blows they stopped again and asked me if I would leave; I told them I would not. Then one of the strongest and most burly in the crowd took the strap himself and gave me twenty-five blows without stopping; that made seventy-five; I heard them say, "Seventy-five." At that time my strength gave way entirely; I grew dizzy and cold; I asked for my coat; that is the last I remember for several minutes. When I recovered myself they were still about me; I was standing; I do not think I had been down; they must have held me up all the time. I heard them say, "He is not dead yet; dead men tell no tales." But still they all seemed disposed, as I thought, to let me go; I heard no threatening, except what passed a few moments afterward. They passed in front of me, and drew their pistols and showed them to me; they told me that if I was not gone within ten days they were all sworn in their camp, and sworn positively, that they would kill me, either privately or publicly.

With that warning they left him with Mr. Ross, on whose advice he went into the gin-house to await the light of the coming day, fearing there might be a return, and he ultimately made his way back to Aberdeen without further molestation.

In April two of the board of school directors who had voted for the school tax were warned to resign and complied without hesitation. About the same time all the teachers on the east side of the river (Tombigbee) were notified to close their schools, and twenty-six schools were immediately suspended. The warnings were given in a body at night, and among the warned was Miss Sarah A. Allen, a lady sent by a missionary society

from Geneseo, Illinois. Eighty Ku-Klux visited her in a body at twelve o'clock at night, calling her from her bed and ordering her to close her school on Wednesday, which she did. Mr. Huggins says, "She is a highly educated and accomplished young lady."

But the space prescribed for this article will not allow further details. There are thirteen volumes of testimony full of just such statements, and indicating a condition of society not to be paralleled in any civilized country. But the acts set forth need no illustration. They speak for themselves. What we have aimed at is to deal with the better class of these raids in which some ceremony is always observed, and which are free from much of the coarseness and vulgarity which characterize the assaults on low persons; and we have taken them from different States, and from points widely separated, in order to show that there must have been unity of design and purpose; and that where the spirit and action were so manifestly alike, it must have been produced by organization springing from the same source.

Happily the prompt measures of the President, taken under the Ku-Klux Act and embracing the numerous arrests, to which some reference has been made, and the trial and conviction of many of the guilty persons engaged in these raids, has pretty much put an end to them; while the exposure of individual members, and the obvious tendency of their acts, has produced such a wholesome influence on Southern society as will probably prevent any general recurrence of these monstrous crimes.

ART. V.—YOUNG ROUMANIA.

DURING the last few years public attention has been so frequently attracted to events transpiring within the domain of those principalities of the Lower Danube that have lately assumed the high-sounding title of Roumania, that we think a few pages devoted to the discussion of the past history, present condition, and future prospects of this new nationality may not be unacceptable.

As regards the past we shall be very brief, in view of the deep interest attaching to its present deeds and *status*. The

three provinces of Wallachia and that of Moldavia, extending along the left bank of the Danube from the Hungarian frontier to the Black Sea and the Russian boundary, claim to be the principal seat of ancient Dacia, a province founded by the Romans under Trajan, after a long and desperate conflict with the native tribes. The Romans held the region until the reign of Aurelianus, when they were gradually conquered or driven away by the inroads of the Goths, Vandals, and other Germanic tribes.

The Roman influence, however, remained, and, through varying fortunes in numerous conflicts, seems in some portion of the territory to have held its own against the aggressions of Greeks and Turks in many and bitter strifes. In certain portions of Wallachia a corruption of the Roman tongue has been preserved, and the people assume to speak the Latin as a living language. But it is so corrupted and debased by being long commingled with native idioms, that it amounts to a figure of speech to call it Latin. But the people cling with ludicrous tenacity to the legends of their early history, and, therefore, when, a few years ago, they succeeded in so far breaking away from the trammels of the surrounding nations as to found a separate nationality, they gave to it the name of Roumania, in view of their descent from ancient Rome.

This, however, has proved a very unfortunate whim, for it has placed them in continual antagonism with themselves and their neighbors, and induced them to strive after and imitate a grade of civilization of which they in reality have no conception. They are surrounded by nationalities so various in character, and so widely different in tendencies, that under the most favorable circumstances they would find themselves in direct contrast with some of them; but by their endeavor to clothe a totally undeveloped people with all the paraphernalia of a high degree of civilization, they only succeed in producing the grossest incongruities.

For many years these provinces have held a peculiar relation to the Sublime Porte, which has given them a sort of protectorate, while it has made them at the same time tributary. This state of things has, perhaps, insured their existence, for the jealousy of the Great Powers in regard to any thing to which Turkey might lay a claim has alone prevented Rou-

mania from being swallowed up by Hungary, Austria, or Russia, which countries are ever looking with longing eyes toward these rich valleys in the hope of some day possessing them.

The Treaty of Paris, after the war of the Crimea, fixed the *status* of Roumania toward Turkey and the Great Powers in a way to assist in the formation of the new nation which Europe seemed to desire as a barrier between the Occident and the Orient. The principalities were to continue to be under the protectorate of the Porte, and the guarantee of the contracting powers, for the enjoyment of all the immunities and privileges of which they were then in possession; but these were very illy defined. And it was further stipulated that these principalities might govern themselves, and without any co-operation or interference of the Porte, within the limits agreed on by the Great Powers and the Turkish government. And thus the whole matter was diplomatically left in so confused and indistinct a state that neither the Great Powers, the Porte, nor the principalities themselves, knew how they stood toward each other.

This seemed to be an opportunity granted to these provinces to see what they could do for themselves. If they could be successful in the experiment of self-government, Europe would be glad to see them succeed, and thus put an end to the vexed question as to what was best to do with the territory lying along the Danube between Hungary and the sea. This was, of course, not agreeable to Turkey, who would like to continue in force the sovereignty still claimed, but of late yielded with a passably good grace, though not by any means relinquished.

For a long series of years the principalities had been governed by native princes under the sovereignty of Turkey. Their rule, however, had been one continued history of intrigues and family strife, ending in revolt or assassination. When, in 1866, the last native prince, Cousa, followed the fate of his predecessors, it was thought best to give up the effort to get along with native rulers, and, with the consent of the Sultan and the Great Powers, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern was called to govern the United Principalities of the Danube. On the occasion of the marriage of this prince, in his auto-

graph letter to the Sultan, he for the first time used the official title of Roumania.

The poor prince virtually accepted a crown of thorns. Roumania, as he took it, was bad enough; but Young Roumania, as it has since developed itself, and whose story we shall mainly tell, is as wayward, self-willed, selfish, and ungovernable a child as ever entered the family of nations. Prince Charles has scarcely spent a happy, quiet hour since he went there, and again and again he has threatened to throw up his charge and leave. He has only been deterred from so doing by an ardent and honest desire to benefit the people over whom he is called to rule, and by the earnest entreaties of the more sensible and thoughtful among the Roumanians, who would see in his departure an end to all their hopes regarding self-government.

The crazy fantasy has taken possession of the young men especially that they are to be the modern Romans, and must look to their supposed ancestors for their political teachings. In this they have been taught by a certain Professor Barmetz, of the Juristic Faculty of Bucharest, the capital, and now deceased. For several years he lectured on the common law of Roumania, and his lectures, left in manuscript, have since been published, and the book is heralded by his pupils as the gospel of the new birth of Roumania. His principal postulates are that ancient Roman law has continued to live in spirit in the traditions of the Dacians, and that it is only necessary to revive this code to attain to ancient Roman greatness. All questions are to be solved in this sense, beginning with the old agrarian laws, according to which two thirds of their possessions must be taken from wealthy landholders and distributed among the people, so that every Roumanian may become a landholder.

With a view to revive national trade and industry, foreign competition must be destroyed; and this is to be effected by driving all strangers from the country, especially the Jews and the Germans. This doctrine also leads, of course, to opposition to a foreign prince, and those who preach it insist that every foreign dynasty must therefore be null and void. These radicals adopt the French cognomen of the "Reds," and, by the aid of the moderate liberals or fractionists, occasionally come

into power; but whether in or out, they are ever causing a world of trouble, as the frequent diplomatic notes regarding affairs in Roumania fully attest.

It is of little use to prove that these assertions of Barmetz are all without foundation, and that the Romans practically never did any such thing; these radicals think they ought to have done so, and this satisfies them as to the doctrine.

As to the presence of foreigners in Roumania, it may be an evil, but it is one very necessary to its existence. The Roumanians, as a people, are singularly lacking in industry and knowledge. They may be divided into two classes: the Boyars, or nobles, who are too proud to do any thing, and the peasants, who scarcely know enough to till the soil successfully. Manufactures, trade, and commerce must therefore be in the hands of strangers, or cease to exist and the State must perish. For centuries the Germans have represented the industrial interests, and the Jews have carried on the trade of the country. The schools owe their idea, their culture, and their teachers to France and Germany. The only way to dispense with these parties is to raise up native substitutes to take their places, and to expel them by being more industrious, more active, and more intelligent than they. So long as this is not the case the persecution of foreigners, as such, is simply a piece of barbarism and inconsistency.

Roumania is indeed a land of inconsistencies and harsh contrasts. In appearance it is neither oriental nor occidental, but partakes to a certain extent of both these qualities. The two grades of civilization mingle, but do not assimilate. The Boyar nobles are ever striving to imitate the luxury and the manners of Western Europe, while the peasants conservatively cling to their old semi-oriental ways. European culture is maintained and developed mainly by the classes that are ill-treated, namely, the Germans and the Jews. In the Carpathian mountains timber is so abundant that the owners cannot obtain remuneration for simply cutting it, while in the neighboring cities fuel is so dear that the poor can scarcely obtain enough for the necessaries of life.

The soil is very rich, and the plains are capable of becoming the granaries of surrounding nations. But over vast regions the agricultural processes are so primitive that the produc-

tion is very limited; and then again, as if to keep up the contrast, one finds model farms where all the appliances of the best English and American implements are brought into use. These same sharp contrasts are met in the cities themselves. Bucharest is noted for them. The fashionable avenue of the capital resembles that of some of the larger cities of Europe; the stores make brilliant displays, and elegant equipages roll by containing aristocratic ladies adorned in princely style. A few rods aside from these, in either direction, one meets open lots covered with rude cabins and reeking with filth, and streets peopled with naked children, lounging men, and smoking women. The only industrials to be seen are the gypsies, with their portable forges, plying their customary occupations.

Civilization seems to have been sprung upon the Roumanians while a large portion of the population are not ready for it, and it sits with no grace on any but the wealthy Boyars, who spend years in Paris and other European capitals and bring back with them their luxurious habits acquired abroad. It were far better for the country had the change been gradual, so that all classes might have grown into it and assimilated with it. There are some good schools and hospitals, but they are sustained and controlled by a few energetic persons for the benefit of a very small fraction of the upper classes. And if these are chided for neglecting the masses below them, they invariably answer that the poorer classes are so deficient in capacity and development that it would be labor lost to endeavor to extend these advantages to them.

The Greek Church is greatly at fault for the low moral and religious condition of the people. The priests are perfectly satisfied with the external observance of the old ritual laws and ceremonies, and spare their subjects any onerous submission to internal convictions. The most incongruous materials will assemble for their religious observances, varying in nationality and belief, or with no belief at all.

Recent laws have abolished all caste distinctions, and still these practically exist all over Roumania. As there is really no native middle class, the chasm between the peasantry, even those who have lately become landholders, and the Boyar nobles, is practically impassable. The Constitution is very generous, with

rights and privileges for the sovereign people; but these latter are totally unacquainted with the simplest forms of parliamentary life, and are thus excluded from a share in the government. The people still believe in what they have learned by tradition, and have little desire to pass beyond the patriarchal form of government. Civil matters are, therefore, entirely in the hands of the heavy landed proprietors, lawyers, professors of the schools, and the literary men generally. These take the greatest interest in the elections, and compose the great majority of the members of their legislative body. About a dozen influential families think themselves born to the people, and are not slow to claim it; and of course those ruling houses, whose access to power is cut off by the fact that a foreign prince is on the throne, are ever ready to find fault about every political mishap that occurs.

This dissatisfaction has given impetus to the growth of the Young Roumanians, who date their birth from the revolutionary period of 1848. It was at this time that arose the cry for nationality in the midst of revolutions, and the example of the Hungarians was not to be lost on the inhabitants of the various provinces of the Lower Danube, who claimed a common origin. As we know, this enthusiasm was followed by no practical effect, for Russian intervention assisted the Austrian authorities in quelling every uprising in this sense. But, though the men were conquered, the spirit lives, and it has gradually grown with the present generation. It has been nurtured in the German fashion by the teachers and students of the higher schools, until it has run into a species of political enthusiasm in which men's theories have got the better of their brains. The Wallachians began to study their Latin origin, and permitted their fancy to find roots with the Latin people that most probably never existed. In this vagary they were not a little assisted by the notions of Louis Napoleon, who fancied himself sent to restore the Latin races on both continents to the power once held by their ancestors.

This was the origin of the modern cry of Pan-Latinism, which so pleased the fancy of the Wallachians that they were ready to run into any extreme which might seem calculated to further their notions. The more radical any political measure, the more sure it was to find favor with the Pan-Latinists, or

Young Roumanians. If they attain the power, the order of the day will be continual friction with all the neighboring States, and continual strife with every nationality in their midst that cannot trace its origin, as do they, to Latin roots. This radical party seems to delight in turmoil and destruction, and chooses to call itself "Red," in imitation of its French exemplars, who are the more acceptable to it because they also boast of their Latinism and declare enmity to other races, and most especially to the Teutonic and Saxon.

Their organ is the "Romanul," an incendiary sheet, whose pleasure seems to be to sow discord within and suspicion toward all foreign powers, whom it accuses of buying up every ministry that comes into power. These agitators present a splendid programme for the future, and thus tickle the fancy of a people who have not much to look to in the past. In this way they obtain a certain popularity which brings many to their ranks through fear of them, and not unfrequently gives them the balance of power. The result of this turmoil and unrest is seen in the continual change of the ministry, which makes a systematic and consistent administration impossible, and prevents the country from making any real progress in political life. These parties are ever working against the ministry, and endeavoring to overthrow it by a vote of want of confidence; for, although the Roumanian Constitution does not require it, tradition at Bucharest demands the retirement of a ministry under such circumstances. And with the ministers fall all the officers of the civil service, even to those in the post-office and telegraph departments, to say nothing of the entire judiciary and fiscal service. All these vacated places are filled with new and inexperienced men, simply because they are adherents of the new ministry.

The government starts again with a majority in Chambers, and with the determination, perhaps, to make great sacrifices to keep it. But the opposition grows at the passage of every measure that happens to displease some one, and the irreconcilables feed the flame of discord until the Chambers are again found in the opposition. Thus no Roumanian is sure of the morrow, and not a few, therefore, are constitutionally timid and hesitating. This condition of things is most deleterious to any true progress, and must be abolished before

any thing good can be expected for the land. Nothing can be accomplished in Roumania until the government resolves to stand firm against the slander of cliques and the outcry of unprincipled journals. This effort Prince Charles has just endeavored to make by insisting on retaining a ministry notwithstanding the passage of an unfavorable vote by a small majority. It remains to be seen whether the malcontents can harass him enough to induce him to give up his purpose.

One means of doing this is by getting up some civil disturbance that will involve his government with other powers—either Turkey, that still claims a certain control, or the Great Powers, that guarantee its existence. The easiest method to effect this, and at the same time to gratify an envious and cruel spirit, is to start the periodical raids against the Jews, or make an attack on the Germans. These have now become so common and so notorious that the attention of the civilized world has been drawn to them, and we think it well to dwell a little on the motives to these outrages.

In earlier times, while Roumania was still under Turkish oppression, many Polish and Russian Jews fled from persecution in their native country and sought a home in Moldavia and Wallachia. In these provinces they found their opportunity in the fact that there was no middle class between the noble and the peasant, and thus the way was open to them to engage in industrial pursuits and the various branches of trade. In this way they soon made themselves useful if not indispensable to the country. When Roumania became independent, and adopted a liberal constitution, the Jews and the Germans came in greater numbers, under the guarantee of personal rights, and established in Bucharest and Jassy various industrial schools in which native children were taught the most necessary trades; but a certain indolence of disposition has prevented them from competing with the frugal and economical Jews and Germans, whom they now regard as obstacles in their way, and therefore heartily hate.

As the Jews became wealthy an effort was made to profit of their means. Some of their liberties were restricted, and oppressive laws were enacted against them. They were not allowed to own houses in the principal streets of Bucharest,

not even to hire them for trading purposes; and still those who followed no occupation, unless they had certain possessions, were condemned as vagabonds and sent over the frontier. They were also forbidden to keep houses of public entertainment in cities and villages. But these laws were never put in force against them, because the Boyars owned the houses and needed the high rents that they could press out of the Jews if the laws were disregarded. They were again made liable to military duty; but this turned out to be only with a view to extort from them large sums to buy themselves free.

Notwithstanding all these oppressions, the Jews have flourished and acquired fortunes; some of the largest banking and commercial houses in the large cities of Roumania belong to them, and half the nobles in the country are in debt to them. Thus they become obnoxious to both classes; the Boyars hate them on account of the annual call for interest on mortgaged estates, and the peasants do the same because they are unpleasant competitors in all the ordinary pursuits of wealth. These animosities have frequently broken out into cruel persecutions, which have darkened the history of these provinces for a long course of years. In the beginning of the last century one of the hospodars of Moldavia led off in a persecution of the Jews which ended in the destruction of their temple, and they bought the permission to reconstruct it only with large sums of money.

The year 1814 is notorious in this connection on account of an attack which did not end in the destruction of their place of worship, but extended to their houses, which were terribly plundered, while about one hundred and thirty of the victims were killed. Similar bloody scenes were enacted in some of the towns immediately after the Crimean war, and a few years ago the capital, Bucharest, was disgraced by an attack on the new and beautiful synagogue. For some years the reports concerning violent excesses against the Jews have been periodical, the excitement regarding one scarcely dying away before we hear of another, and these have in large measure been stimulated by hostile measures of the government, although the authorities take good care to make a great show of indignation over the very outrages which they are largely responsible in instigating.

Old ordinances against the Jews are allowed to remain as dead letters for years because their execution would be contrary to the interests of the wealthy classes. In the meanwhile the peasants become uneasy and restless about the oppression of the nobles, and, to satisfy the former with some sort of revenge, they are stirred up to believe that the Jews and the foreigners, especially the Germans, are the cause of all their troubles, and are induced to believe that until these classes are expelled they can never expect real prosperity. Now it is a dangerous thing to attack the Germans, for they have consuls at their back to protect them, and of late years strong governments to protect the consuls. There is, therefore, nothing left on which the peasants may safely vent their spite but the poor Jews, who have no nationality as such, and accordingly the raid is as usual turned against them. And this is always easily effected under the cry that it is necessary to protect the unsophisticated peasant against the cunning and overreaching Jew.

But what is most remarkable about the case is the fact that these persecutions are mostly set in motion by the leaders of the liberal party—the Young Roumanians. Even Prime Minister Bratiano, while holding his short lease of power, did not hesitate to oppose the removal of Jewish disabilities in his zeal for what he and his followers call the national element. He was ready to acknowledge that the despised and ill-treated Jew had performed a most important part in the regeneration of the material interests of the country, but the Jew had had his day, and must be dismissed.

These "Reds," as they delight to call themselves in imitation of their French exemplars, frequently find a means of annoying the government party, and of involving it with protecting Turkey and the Great Powers by getting up a raid against the Jews. These cruelties exasperate the world to such an extent that Christendom cries out against it; the powers appeal to Turkey to put an end to them; Turkey threatens to interfere with her troops if the outrages do not cease; the home government explains and apologizes, and shows its weakness and actual inability to control these matters; when, finally, the ministry will be so embarrassed that a vote of want of confidence is gotten through the Chambers, and the ministry gives

way for a new set. This confusion was just what the "Reds" wanted, and they gain their point.

In all the provinces under the protectorate of Turkey the European consuls have almost unlimited power over the subjects of their respective governments. If foreigners in these lands violate the local laws they are sent for trial to their own consuls, and not to Turkish or local authorities. But this provision is nearly always violated in regard to the Jews, unless these latter are wealthy and influential from their European connections, mercantile or otherwise. These poor wretches are therefore always given over to the tender mercies of their worst enemies, and the only protection they obtain is from the protest of the consuls of their home government, which occasionally effects release from punishment after the greatest part of their undeserved infliction has expired.

The prejudice against the Jews in Roumania is increased by the fact that the largest part of them are Germans. This heaps against them in the mind of the Young Roumanians the double charge of adverse nationality and despised religion. As bigoted Latinists and enthusiastic admirers of the French radicals, the Roumanians have every reason to hate and attack these unwelcome guests, and it is no easy matter for the German powers to protect their subjects in a diplomatic way on account of the numberless subterfuges and apologies that rise to the surface when matters assume a serious aspect. To interfere with military force would so complicate affairs while a German prince is on the throne that it must be reserved as a last resort, for the first move on the part of Germany to send troops into Roumania would be followed by a terrible hue and outcry on the part of the French, who would like nothing better than the opportunity thus to show that Germany has sinister designs on the banks of the Danube.

If France would consent to use its influence to stop these persecutions, in conference with the other powers, the result might be effected. But this would be to aid the Germans in keeping Prince Charles on the throne, and to weaken the radical party in Roumania—who are all enthusiastic admirers of France and French policy—toward the Germans; so that in these singular political combinations and sympathies the Jews are the great sufferers. The misfortune for Roumania is the

fact of a liberal constitution for a people that is in nowise prepared for it. A humane prince is thus powerless against the greatest barbarities committed by a party calling itself liberal, and committing outrages in the name of progress. Its unfitness for liberal institutions was clearly proved on a recent occasion when a jury in a case of murder of some Jews notoriously released the murderers and condemned to prison some of the Jews who had escaped massacre. And still these liberal institutions of Roumania are lauded to the skies by French publicists and journalists of a certain stripe, who in their enthusiasm for Roumania do their fair share in making this semi-barbarous people vain of their most shameful deeds.

These persecutions against Jews and Germans have largely increased since the war of 1870. German artisans and scholars, merchants and railroad builders, have been made to feel it most painfully. The radical leader, Bratiano, recently declared that he would rather wade in the mud than travel on railroads built by the Germans, and appealed to his countrymen to form associations all over the country with a view to break off all intercourse with the Jews and the Germans by refusing to buy from or sell to them, or in any manner to associate with them, and to the press to oppose every effort at German colonization, which had been recommended as a means to revive the industries of the country and develop its resources. In these sentiments and aims Bratiano is supported by many journalists, and by municipal magistrates and teachers in the public schools, and these teachings and instigations have borne a rich crop of outrages. Houses have been plundered, synagogues destroyed, cemeteries desecrated, wives and daughters outraged, and men and children murdered. And the slightest provocations are sufficient to start these outrages. Some time ago a renegade Jew from Russia robbed a Greek church of some of its valuable ornaments, and hid them, by chance or intent, in an immense building where lived a Jewish Rabbi and some forty Jewish families. The things were discovered, and the thief, to shield himself, declared the Rabbi a party to the crime. This was enough to start the excitement, and immediately there commenced a fearful attack on Rabbi and people, all that could be found, and after these had suffered veritable martyrdom, a judicial investigation proved them all

innocent and perfectly ignorant of the fellow who had stolen the articles and thus inculpated them. But the persecution had continued for days, until the Jews had lost nearly all they possessed, and it was only arrested by the authorities when the mob could find nothing more to steal. The Jews then received the poor satisfaction of being declared innocent, and the permission to depart unpunished. They were fortunate in escaping with their lives through such an excitement.

On another occasion a child was lost for some days. At last it was found wandering about in the porches of an old synagogue. This was enough to start an outcry—the child had evidently been stolen by the Jews and hidden in the building that they might have Christian blood with which to sprinkle their door-posts on the occasion of the approaching Passover. This flimsy story flew like wildfire, and in a few minutes every Jew who was so unfortunate as to be on the public street was attacked with stones and clubs, and the outrage soon extended to their homes and synagogues, growing into fearful proportions, and resulting in cruelties that would put to blush the Parisian Commune. This outbreak was in a fair way of extending all over the provinces where the persecutors could find victims, especially in the large cities, when the foreign consuls in Bucharest joined in a protest to the government against this cruel bestiality toward the Jews; and this combined action of the foreign representatives was officially communicated to their respective governments, who again threatened to interfere.

This threat starts up the Turk; he reprimands the prince; the latter appeals to the police and military authorities to be vigilant in suppressing the disorders; these authorities succeed in getting into operation by the time the excesses have exhausted themselves for the time being, and nobody suffers but the innocent Jews. And it is probable that these disgraceful scenes will be repeated from time to time until some great revolution shall wipe out Roumania or place it unconditionally into the hands of some power strong enough to control the violence of its ignorant and prejudiced masses. But as long as the European Chess-board has its pieces so arranged that not one can be moved in the least without alarming all the others,

so long the kings will look out for their own interests and leave the pawns to shift for themselves.

The peculiar position of Roumania, surrounded by so many nationalities that would gladly possess her, has really given her existence, and still secures it to her, notwithstanding her apparent unworthiness of this distinction and favor. On the east is Russia, separated only by a small river, across which this great power can look and perceive a portion of her own territory violently wrested from her, and which she will seize the first opportunity to regain. Bulgaria on the south, and the other Slavonian provinces of Turkey, would like nothing better than, under the stimulating influence of a revival of the Russo-Greek Church, to take Roumania and make a Slavonic Confederation of the Danube. In the west, Austro-Hungary would not hesitate a moment to seize and incorporate Roumania, with a view to possess the fertile land and an unobstructed passage to the Black Sea, if the other powers were not on the watch to prevent it. Swarms of foreign agents from France and Russia help keep up an agitation in the interior, and prepare parties to favor one or the other of these foreign interests when the time to decide shall arrive; and so the peculiar position of the new nation in regard to her surroundings seems to protect her from interference from without or within, no matter how strong may be the appeal of the sufferers.

The true course for Roumania to follow would be to tend to her own internal development during these dissensions of her enemies, and in the meanwhile to become so strong and respectable that when they are prepared to absorb her she might be prepared to resist, and claim the sympathies of Europe, not from position or policy, but because of her worth and the most significant fact that a strong semi-oriental nation seems to be needed on the Lower Danube as a sort of transition land between the Orient and the Occident. And she has the means to accomplish this in her midst in the very elements which she is insanely trying to drive away. But instead of tending to her own political and industrial development, she is continually fighting over the battles of half the Continent of Europe. During the entire war between Germany and France she was in a fever of excitement and exasperation, and when the German forces entered Paris the principal radical journal appeared

with a deep black border, to give, as it said, an outward expression to its internal grief at the barbaric invasion of the Teutonic hordes into the center of civilization.

When in Bucharest the Germans desired to assemble, as they did throughout the world, to celebrate a "festival of Peace," they were not allowed to do it unmolested—almost the only instance the world over. They were disturbed by noisy crowds in the religious services of the festival, and their banquet was totally broken up by the invasion of a brutal mob that smashed in windows, burst in doors, and demolished all the preparations for a joyous feast. Even the German consul-general was attacked with stones with the cry of "Death to the Germans! Long live the French!" The conservative premier, Ghika, who doubtless greatly regretted the outrage, did his best, with the aid of the tardy police, to quell the disturbance, but nobody heeded him. Young Roumania was on its mettle, and was determined that neither banquet should be eaten nor speech be delivered; and so it was—the rioters having it all their own way until the military and the firemen appeared, when the latter dispersed the mob by discharging streams of water on the people.

But the Young Roumanians found that they had no helpless Jews to deal with this time. Bismarck demanded full reparation for the insult, and received it. The entire ministry fell. Some eighty individuals, mainly students and policemen, were convicted of being engaged in the disorder, and even the chief of police was discharged. The Sultan informed the ruling prince, who, as a German, was of course innocent of the outrage, that on its repetition thirty thousand Turkish troops would march in and keep order. The Prince in return replied that in future every effort would be made to protect the Germans from violence or insult, but showed very evident chagrin that the Sultan had taken this occasion to remind him that the Turk was still the supreme power in Roumania.

Since then the Germans have been let alone, and the Young Roumanians have confined their amusements to the defenseless Jews. The spirit is the same, but they indulge it where there is less danger. This new ministry lived but a little while; it met at the outset the accusation that it was the creation of foreign influence, and received the nickname of "Prussian."

The opposition did nothing but oppose, and at last succeeded in defeating the ministry by a majority of six. The Prince, however, determined not to yield, ordered the ministers to retain their places, and dissolved the Assembly, while the latter left the hall with the cry of "Live the Constitution!" This was the first decided effort on the part of the Prince to introduce a sterner *régime* than had been adopted by his predecessors, and as the people knew that the garrison was remanded to the barracks, and was ready at any moment to put down a hostile demonstration, they thought it best quietly to disperse.

It was supposed for a little while that this bold step on the part of Prince Charles would cost him his throne; but he was fully sustained by encouraging telegrams from Berlin and Vienna, the publication of which gave a moral influence stronger than any military demonstration that he could have made. The dissolution of the Chambers was not, however, regarded so much a solution as a postponement of the troubles between people and prince, for the elections to follow for a new house could alone solve the difficulty. These were attended with great agitation, and the "Reds" made a desperate effort to stir up the country against the "imported prince" whom they desired to banish. Their efforts proved fruitless, for the thinking classes became more and more convinced that, however much the country needed regeneration, these fierce, irreconcilable radicals were not the men to do it. Charles received numerous addresses from the most influential families of the various provinces, assuring him of their support, and inviting him to visit their sections of country for a personal acquaintance with the inhabitants.

The elections resulted in a complete defeat of the "Reds;" not one of their prominent candidates was elected, while most of the leading conservatives were returned by a large majority. The nervous agitation attending the election was largely owing to the fact, which was generally understood, that in case the Prince was not supported in the popular elections he would abdicate and leave the country. His triumphant indorsement was therefore the cause of much joy throughout the land, and was followed by popular festivals in Bucharest and other cities.

This looked like the commencement of a new era for Rou-

mania, and the Prince himself seemed greatly encouraged. He had passed through so many trials, and found the Roumanians in so many respects unreasonable and ungovernable, that he was evidently determined this time to carry out his oft-expressed resolution of abdication, feeling that it was utterly hopeless for him to attempt to effect any reform or do any good. This indorsement induced him to try once more, and he opened the new Chambers with very encouraging words, and with the recommendation of a series of practical measures of great utility to the civil and industrial advancement of the country. His words were warmly received, and he and his ministry were assured of a steady support on the part of the Assembly. And thus a great crisis was safely passed through, for the departure of Prince Charles under the circumstances would have agitated the country to its greatest depths, and most certainly have endangered its continuance as an independent nationality. Whether much will have been gained in the end the future alone can decide; but history will accord to the present ruler the credit of having faithfully endeavored, under the most embarrassing circumstances, to administer the trust reposed in him.

Among the first measures of the new legislative body were a few efforts to correct hasty legislation on the part of their predecessors. The constitution adopted was adapted to a fully developed and highly civilized people, but neither its spirit nor its workings were understood by the great mass of the Roumanians. They had introduced jury trials, and under the system robbery and murder had increased in an alarming degree. They had established full liberty of the press, and it had led to the most revolting and alarming abuses. They had introduced universal suffrage, and the ignorant masses voted for the most ridiculous and inconsistent measures. Finally, they had prohibited foreign colonization on their soil, and their fertile plains were lying waste for the want of intelligent culture. To grapple with questions like these in a statesmanlike manner they needed the experience of a slowly-developed past which they did not possess. It seemed like pigmies undertaking the work of giants. It was a rare task to adapt the governments of modern civilization to so incongruous a community, and the wisest men might be excused for failures in many instances where the first efforts must be experiments on virgin soil.

It was believed that the most imperative need of the country was a system of railroads to develop its resources, and a very extensive one, recommended by foreign capitalists, was adopted, and made a national undertaking with national obligations. But the system itself was so entirely out of proportion to the ability of the respective regions either to construct or sustain it that all parties connected with the enterprise soon became embarrassed, and vast sums were lost in the undertaking. The contractors were soon unable to continue their work, and ceased to prosecute it when the Roumanian government refused to pay the interest on their obligations to the amount of many millions, which in the meanwhile had passed into the hands of foreign holders. These parties felt that they had been victimized, and were influential enough in Germany to induce the government to interfere in their behalf and threaten summary measures if they were not treated justly. The whole matter has been the cause of complications of sufficient magnitude to endanger again the existence of the nation, for Bismarck threatened to appeal to the Sultan to interfere in his suzerain right, and any action on the part of foreign governments acknowledging this continued suzerainty of Turkey is dangerous to the independence of Roumania. This Damocles sword of their railroad embroglio continues to hang over them, and is likely to do so for years.

This unfortunate complication has of late absorbed the attention of the nation almost exclusively, to the great detriment of other matters of intense import to the people at large. The question of the reorganization of the Roumanian Greek Church is one of prime necessity. The position of the clergy is poorly defined in the new constitution, and they therefore continue to exercise a power in the Church which is quite incompatible with the spirit of that document. They are quite often induced to enter the political arena, and, with their influence with the common people, they can easily effect an election to the Chambers, where their votes are seldom on the side of true progress.

But above all, the Roumanians need some system of popular education whereby the masses may be raised from their exceeding ignorance, and made capable of comprehending their situation and their responsibilities. There is probably no greater anomaly in the world than the comparatively liberal

constitution of Roumania for a people who have not the remotest idea of political rights and privileges, and, to tell the truth, no great desire to enjoy them. The masses are still governed by their prejudices, which are those handed down to them from the Middle Ages, and are thus the prey of political adventurers or ignorant enthusiasts. With such material at their command, the wildest and most unprincipled men can start or keep alive persecutions that are not only cruel and illogical, but of the greatest disadvantage to the country, and in direct antagonism to the spirit of the age. It is thus that the Rosettis and Bratianos of the Young Roumanian party can assemble under their red flag the crowds of followers eager for any attack on the Jews, or for a fray with the Germans as intrusive foreigners on their soil, while, in fact, these parties are indispensable to the development of the nation. The periodical return of these cruelties has of late become so frequent and so revolting that the sentiment of Christendom will soon insist on some interference in the interest of humanity, regardless of national sensitiveness or the danger of disturbing the equilibrium of power among European courts.

Art. VI.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly, October, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Roger Williams as an Author. 2. The Three Systems of Belief in China. 3. Homer and the Old Testament. 4. The Themes and Methods of Apostolic Preaching. 5. Dr. John Clarke.

Christian Quarterly, October, 1872. (Cincinnati.)—1. American Civilization. 2. "Judaic Baptism." 3. The Philosophy of "Getting Religion." 4. The Vatican Council and the Old Catholics. 5. Collegiate Education for the People.

Mercersburg Review, October, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Nature and Grace. 2. The Old and the New. 3. The Sacramental Theory of the Heidelberg Catechism. 4. Why are we Reformed? 5. Faith, a Normal Activity of the Soul. 6. The Inscription of the Catacombs. 7. Christianity and the Church.

New Englander, October, 1872. (New Haven.)—1. The Preaching to the Spirits in Prison. 2. Our National Banks. 3. Cyprian and his Times. 4. The New Lives of Sir Walter Raleigh. 5. Music as a Fine Art. 6. The Oberlin Council. 7. Sectarian Symbols.

North American Review, October, 1872. (Boston.)—1. Herder. 2. The Germanic World of Gods. 3. Niccolini's Anti-Papal Tragedy. 4. American Novels. 5. Kristofer Janson, and the Reform of the Norwegian Language. 6. The Political Campaign of 1872.

PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, October, 1872. (New York.)—1. The Righteousness of God. 2. Faith: Its Place and Prerogative. 3. Florentine Philosophy in the Days of the Medici. 4. Annihilation of the Wicked. 5. John Wesley, His Character and Opinions. 6. Outlines of J. A. Dorner's System of Theology. 7. Japan. 8. The Early History of the Ottoman Turks.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, October, 1872. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Church. 2. Explosions of Steam Boilers. 3. Application of the Principle of the Reformation. 4. Free Self-Government. 5. Subscription to the Confessions. 6. Faith the Essential Element for Right Living. 7. The Latest Yoke of Bondage; or, Dr. Finney's Ministerial Test.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1872. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Address to the Conference of the Evangelical Union Church of Scotland, Convened in Glasgow, September, 1872. 2. Cumberland Presbyterianism Teaches Salvation by Grace, without Implicating God in the Destruction of the Wicked. 3. The New Covenant. 4. Exegesis of Acts ii, 38. 5. A Solemn Charge. 6. Perseverance of the Saints. 7. A View of the Fundamental Aspect of the Application of the Principle of the Reformation by Luther and Melanchthon. 8. The Rationale of Prayer.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1872. (Boston.)—1. John Murray. 2. The Genesis of Science. 3. The Preparation for Christianity. 4. Sears's "Heart of Christ." 5. A Popular Objection to Universalism Reviewed. 6. Letters of Murray and Richards. 7. The Gospel Minister.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, AND THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC, October, 1872. (Andover.)—1. Patristic Views of the Two Genealogies of Our Lord. 2. The Progress of Christ's Kingdom in its Relation to Civilization. 3. On "The Man of Sin," 2 Thess. ii, 3–9. 4. Revelation and Inspiration. 5. Infant Baptism and a Regenerated Church-Membership Irreconcilable. 6. The Influence of the Pulpit. 7. The Three Fundamental Methods of Preaching—Preaching Extempore. 8. Notes on Egyptology.

It would seem that the subject of

THE RELATION OF INFANTS TO THE CHURCH

is, under the liberal supervision of the Bibliotheca Sacra, undergoing a fresh revision. The Editors say: "Having inserted in a previous number an Article favoring the proposition that the infants of professing believers ought to be baptized, and are constituted by their baptism members of the visible Church, and having inserted in the present number an Article favoring the proposition that infants are not members of the visible Church and ought not to be baptized, the Editors of the Bibliotheca Sacra expect to insert, in a future number, an Article favoring the proposition that the infant children of Church-members ought to be baptized, but are not made members of the visible Church by that ordinance."

The Fifth Article is a candid and catholic view of the subject by a learned Baptist writer, partly in review of an Article in our own Quarterly by the late lamented Dr. Nadal, who, as our readers will recollect, sustained Infant Baptism on the ground that *the Church did not require regeneration in her membership.* Although we hold this to be the most unscriptural, most dangerous, and most un-

Methodistical of all the views proposed, we did not feel at liberty to exclude the Church from hearing what one of her most learned and loyal sons had to say in its behalf. The Christian Church, in our view, aims, however imperfectly the aim is accomplished, to be the Church of the Regenerate. Dr. Nadal's view, we think, contradicts our Thirteenth Article of Faith, which declares that "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of *faithful* men." In regard to which it may be affirmed, 1. That the unregenerate are not "faithful" men; 2. That in the view of the Church the baptized infant is a "faithful" man. If "seekers" have in former times been admitted by our Church to the "class," it is not properly as members of the Church. We never knew a "seeker" to be baptized; he can be dropped by the pastor without trial; and all such should be, so soon as they cease to be sincere "seekers." They are received into the "class" simply in order to receive the aid of a spiritual adviser so long as they feel the need of advice and are disposed to profit by it. The present Reviewer, as a Baptist, of course agrees with us in rejecting the doctrine of an unregenerate Church. He differs from us in inferring, therefrom, the impropriety of Infant Baptism.

The indefiniteness of opinion on this subject, described by Mr. Marsh as general, certainly exists in our own Church. It arises, we believe, (and in this entire Article we desire to be understood as speaking not representatively but individually,) from the fact that a majority of our Church has unconsciously varied from our own standards. A large majority has, if we mistake not, contrary to Arminius, to Wesley, to Fletcher, and to our Articles of Faith, come to hold that *the living infant is neither justified nor regenerate, and becomes so only on condition of death.* This we understand from Mr. Marsh to be the present Baptist view. It seems to imply a present infant condemnation; and at any rate, under the Calvinistic view of an irrespective, unforeknowing decree, both of foreordination and reprobation, the logical result is eternal infant damnation. This last doctrine Mr. Marsh repudiates in behalf of all Calvinists of the present day; but, accepting fully his rejection of the dogma, we aver that logically he ought to accept it. Here, if pressed closely, he would find himself involved in a "puzzle" quite as perplexing as any he imputes to Pedobaptists.

The theory which, in our individual view, comes most nearly to our best standards, is very nearly in Mr. Marsh's words: "That infants are to be baptized because under the atonement they are

born regenerate." Dr. Nadal refers to this theory, and repudiates it as being "certainly in the very teeth of the teachings of the Orthodox Church in all ages." When this view was advocated by Mercein, Hibbard, and Gilbert Haven, it was rejected very indignantly by most of our best thinkers; and, in humorous allusion to the initials of the last writer, (now one of our Bishops,) it was said that G. H. stood for "Great Heretic." Yet we believe it clear that Dr. Hibbard's view is about the view of the Church, if her formulas are to decide the question.

One minute but important correction, however, is to be made. Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, and Fisk could not be said to hold that infants are "born regenerate." The true statement would be that they are born into the world depraved; but, as Fisk expresses it, "the atonement meets them with its provisions at their entrance." Their justification or regeneration, so far as it exists, is not *congenital* but *post-genital*. The atonement fills this probationary world with its influence, and the human being receives his atoning justification consequent upon his having entered into it. It is as if a room were filled with a purifying influence, and a leper is cleansed by entering within its walls. The question is not as to the genuineness or the depth of the depravity as derived from Adam, or from the immediate parent. That depravity is done up in all the elements of the fœtal man. Nor does regeneration, infant or adult, absolutely remove it until completed at the glorification; for both infant and adult still retain susceptibility to temptation and sin, mortality, disease, and death, until the final renovation.

And here comes in our reply to Dr. Nadal's argument against infant regeneration, pushed by him with much emphasis, drawn from the fact of the sinfulness of the growing and grown-up race. It is much the same argument as Watson pushes against the non-depravity of the race drawn from the uniform wickedness of the race. But Nadal's argument has none of the force of Watson's. Our inherent depravity is not entirely removed by regeneration until the regeneration is completed at the resurrection. For the best of us, the maintenance of our saved or regenerate state is a work of care, skill, and firm volition. These qualities the unnurtered child does not possess, and hence falls an easy victim to sin. The nurtured child may retain an unforfeited Christian character. It is at this age, indeed, that docility to truth, conscientiousness, and simple piety often unfold themselves.

Here let us observe, 1. Our later writers do not rigidly insist on

the word regeneration as the technic to designate this *saved* state of the living infant. That word is framed in Scripture normally for adults. And it may be objected as absurd that a man should be generated and regenerated in instantaneous succession. This is not, indeed, a very valid objection. What is meant by these writers is, that *the state of the saved living infant is essentially the same for an infant as the state into which regeneration brings the adult.* And so infant justification is, for the infant, the *same as that justification into which faith brings the adult believer.* The adult believer is not baptized—let our Baptist brother mark this—because he *believes;* but because he is *justified* and *regenerated* in sequence to his belief. *The infant, possessing that same justification, is entitled to that same baptism.*

2. This does not imply baptismal regeneration or ritualism. The infant is not regenerate because he is baptized, but is baptized because he is virtually a believer, and so virtually justified and regenerate.

3. This avoids the danger of an unregenerate Church-membership. If the infant so grows up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord as never to lose his saved state, (no imaginary case,) he needs no conversion. He will bring forth the fruits showing him entitled to an unforfeited Church-membership. Otherwise, his membership is forfeited, as in any other case of apostasy. Nevertheless, not only most children, but most adults, often need converting over and over again.

With regard to our standard authors, in view of this discussion, we reproduce a few paragraphs published by us in our October Quarterly for 1864 in noticing a book by Miss Beecher:

> Miss Beecher announces that a new development is taking place in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which, she imagines, will result in childhood Church-membership. We doubt the *newness* of the matter she describes. To show how great our advance is, she quotes a passage from Arminius, in which that great doctor taught that infants are by "the covenant comprehended and adjudged in their parents," and so have "sinned" and become "obnoxious to God's wrath." But if she will turn to his works, vol. i, page 318, (American edition,) she will find that by that same covenant there is, in his opinion, a provision of grace in which children are so included, as putative believers, "as not to seem to be obnoxious to condemnation." Both of these views are consistent, and may be correct. Condemned by the covenant in Adam, living children, like believers, may be justified in Christ. If Miss Beecher will turn to Fletcher's Checks, vol. i, page 461, she will find that writer expressly maintaining the doctrine of both the "justification" and the "regeneration" of living infants. In a note he adds these remarkable words: "Those who start at every expression they are not used to will ask if *our Church admits the justification of infants?* I answer, UNDOUBTEDLY; since her clergy, by her direction, say over myriads of infants, 'We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it has pleased thee to REGENERATE *this infant.*'" He then proceeds

to prove that this *regeneration* is antecedent to baptism, and universal. And he instructs us so to construe his mention of "the regeneration of infants," in his Appeal, (*a work adopted in our course of ministerial study,*) Part V, Inference 7, as designating regeneration unconditional upon baptism, and of course as existing in the case of every *living* infant. So firmly convinced was Fletcher that Adamic depravity does not preclude infant regeneration, that it was in a powerful work in favor of depravity that he maintained such regeneration. If this be a new development, Miss B. may be thus assured it is by no means "a new doctrine." According to Fletcher's interpretation, indeed, our infant baptismal service teaches the same doctrine. Our baptismal Scripture lesson from Mark x, 13, etc., which declares "of such is the kingdom of heaven," teaches, in his view, that *infants are truly born of the Spirit as ground of their now being baptismally "born of water."* They are to receive the outward sign because they *have received* the inward grace. We say not that these teachings of Fletcher are an article of our Church faith, nor that they are true or false. We only say that they are found in one of the standards which has always been put by our Church into the hands of her young ministers; and such is even there affirmed to be the doctrine of our standing Ritual. If Fletcher's interpretations be true, Miss B. will specially observe, *we have been proclaiming living infant regeneration at every infant baptism from the very foundation of our Church.* But this Arminian and Fletcherian view is very different from her Pelagian denial of a depravity by nature derived from Adam.

Mr. Wesley's views of the baptismal Scripture lesson appear scarce different from Fletcher's. "The kingdom of heaven" there mentioned he held to be the "kingdom set up in the world," (see his comment on Mark x, 14, and Matt. xix 14,) that is, the regenerate earthly Church; he held that little children "have a right to enter" that kingdom or Church; and that "the members of the kingdom" "are such," that is, "natural" children, or "grown persons of a childlike spirit." That membership he interprets to be not contingent and prospective, or conditioned upon death, but real and present. And yet he believed that no one can be within that kingdom who is not regenerate. (See his note on John iii, 5.) We have, then, the syllogistic premises: All members of the kingdom of heaven are regenerate; Children are such members; and then what conclusion a logician like Mr. Wesley would draw we leave others to decide.

Dr. Fisk's view appears in the following words:

"Although all moral depravity, derived or contracted, is damning in its nature, still, by virtue of the atonement, the destructive effects of derived depravity are counteracted; and guilt is not imputed until by a voluntary rejection of the Gospel remedy man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his own choice. Hence, although, abstractly considered, this depravity is destructive to the possessors, *yet through the grace* of the Gospel ALL ARE BORN FREE FROM CONDEMNATION. So the Apostle Paul: "As by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—*Calvinistic Controversy.*

Here we are told that all are born "free from condemnation;" and this freedom from condemnation is identical with the "justification" named by St. Paul. And this freedom from condemnation or justification (not merely a title to contingent prospective justification) is at birth upon each living individual infant; and universal, being in spite of our depravity derived from the atonement. The infant does not wait for death before he is justified. Death, actual or approaching, is no condition of salvation.

In regard to Mr. Fletcher's doctrine of infant justification we remark:

1. No one affirms that the regeneration of an infant, as taught by Fletcher, is psychologically absurd, or contrary to human or Christian consciousness. *The doctrine of infant regeneration, either unconditional or conditional upon baptism, is no new doctrine, but has been a dogma in all the great sections of the Church, whether Greek, Roman, or Protestant.* This is a valid contradiction to Dr. Nadal's statement quoted above, that infant regeneration is "in the teeth of the teachings of the Orthodox Church of all ages." The regeneration of the infant is nothing different in nature from that in the adult, except as modified by its subject; and the use of the term is in both cases equally proper, involving no innovation in theology of

either thought or language. If an infant can be depraved it can also be undepraved; *if it can be positively unregenerate it can also be regenerate.* In the infant nature as truly as in the adult there may exist all the potencies, predispositions, and predeterminate tendencies, natural or gracious, for an actual, though not responsible, moral nature, good or bad.

2. The doctrine of depravity is neither invalidated in nor modified by the doctrine of infant regeneration, whether unconditional or conditioned upon birth, baptism, or death, actual or approaching. In either case the depravity comes from Adam, is by nature, and is equally complete; and, in either case, regeneration comes from Christ and is by grace, being extra to and above nature. The unborn John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost," (Luke i, 15,) and "leaped" at the approach of the mother of the unborn Saviour. The unborn Jesus was "that holy thing." And such cases at once explode the objection of the "manifest absurdity" of "regeneration between conception and birth." Nor is there any more absurdity in the infant being *regenerated* between conception and birth, than in his being *depraved* at conception or between conception and birth. And this would seem to finish, too, all the argument about the absurdity of generation and regeneration being simultaneous.

3. If Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, and Fisk are right in their positions, then the Arminian doctrine of falling from grace must be true. All adult sinners are apostates. And we see the reason why Calvinists must reject those positions unless they would become Arminians. All who become unregenerate or unjustified, that is, all adult sinners, as Fletcher expresses it, have "sinned away the justification of infants." Or, as Fisk says, the "man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his choice," and not until then is "sin imputed unto him." If there be those happy exceptions, who have evidently not "sinned away the justification of infants," Fletcher would doubtless have held them to be Christians, and at responsible age have admitted them to communion. And an Arminian like Fletcher would have no difficulty with our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again," etc.; for he would understand that such words are addressed to all apostates, that is, to all adult sinners, entirely irrespective of any past experience, whether of an infant or a previous adult regeneration.

To all this we may add that the Seventeenth of our Articles of Faith declares that "Baptism is . . . a sign of regeneration;" and that "The baptism of children is to be retained in the Church." That is, children are to receive the "sign of regeneration." But, surely, the sign ought not to be conferred where the reality does not and may never exist. The "outward sign of an inward grace" is a false sign where there is no "inward grace."

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, October, 1872. (London.)—1. The "Servant of the Lord" in Isaiah. 2. Of the Beautiful in Worship. 3. Phenomenalism in Morals. 4. Frederick Denison Maurice. 5. The Philosophy of Prayer. 6. The Problem of Job. 7. The Presbytery of Wandsworth, erected in 1572. 8. Reprinted Article—The Antagonism of Religion and Culture.

Edinburgh Review, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Corea. 2. New Shakspearean Interpretation. 3. Memorials of Baron Stockmar. 4. Terrestrial Magnetism. 5. The Fiji Islands. 6. The Life of Henry Thomas Colebrooke. 7. The Progress of Medicine and Surgery. 8. Grote's Aristotle. 9. The Past and Future of Naval Tactics.

London Quarterly Review, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Duke of Wellington as a Cabinet Minister. 2. The Completion of St. Paul's. 3. Baron Stockmar. 4. The Consciousness of Dogs. 5. Velasquez. 6. Journal of a French Diplomatist in Italy. 7. East Africa Slave Trade. 8. The Position of Parties.

Westminster Review, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Heroes of Hebrew History. 2. Pindar. 3. Free Public Libraries. 4. The Descent of Man. 5. The Scotch Education Settlement of 1872. 6. France: Her Position and Prospects. 7. The Æsthetics of Physicism.

London Quarterly Review, October, 1872. (London.)—1. Music and Poetry: Their Origin and Functions. 2. William Tyndale. 3. The Higher Ministry of Nature. 4. New England Puritan Literature: Michael Wigglesworth. 5. Lutheranism. 6. London: Civic and Social. 7. The Bampton Lecture on Methodism.

The London, under the editorship of Rev. Dr. Rigg, sustains well a comparison with the other British Quarterlies. It is modeled after the standing pattern, in style, size, and, unfortunately, in the practice of withholding the names of the writers of the Articles. This rule was adopted by the original of the Quarterlies, the Edinburgh, from the fact that the clique of fast young Whigs who started that concern possessed more brains than reputation as yet, and the revelation of the authorship would have destroyed the power of the production. As our conservative friend, Mr. Bull, is still fond of perpetuating an institute long after the reason for its existence has ceased, from the pure respectability, not to say the absurdity, of the thing, this unwise custom seems to be held by all the English Quarterlies with the sacredness of a fetich. The best French and German high periodicals give the names. Even our own old North American, that so long aped its English predecessors, has, in accordance with the spirit of "modern thought," commenced the habit of placing the full name of the writer at the bottom of each Article, like a signature to a bank-note. The withholding of the names cheats the reader of a pleasure, and the author of his just right. To the reader of a good Article it is a just and honorable enjoyment to know the name and to thank and honor the man by whose labor and talent he has been gratified and benefited. To the author belongs a right to the just reputation accruing from his productions; and last of all should a Quarterly, which remunerates most poorly of all periodicals, cheat the author of his fame as well as of his money. It is, indeed, often the case that an accident is manufactured to enable his name to leak out; or a newspaper paragraphist is

made to whisper the secret very slyly to the public; which is simply adding charlatanry to injustice. The mysterious *we* of the early Edinburgh did represent an unknown and even dreaded power. But that time has passed, and Mr. *We* is a sham, and an Article covered under its prestige has no more weight than if signatured with the name of its author. Our own humble Quarterly has nearly created a small literary republic, in the last few years, by calling out contributors, and announcing their names.

The Seventh Article is an able and courteous refutation of objections against Methodism made by the Bampton Lecturer for 1871.

The following passage says what is no more than truth in regard to

THE COMPLETENESS OF METHODIST THEOLOGY.

"We must remind the Lecturer of what he must needs know, though he takes no pains to show that he is aware of it, that Methodism, while faithful to its peculiar lessons, claims to be a faithful teacher of the whole compass of theological science. It teaches its ministers, and through them its people, the "truth as it is in Jesus," without the omission of any one element of that truth. It strives also to exhibit Christian doctrine in its integrity and in its "proportion," as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures. The faith delivered to the saints has lost nothing in its keeping. It has its system of theology complete in all its parts; basing its existence, and its work in the world, not upon any one or two specific doctrines, but upon one broad foundation of Christian truth. The secession from the Church of England which this book deplores has not involved a separation from the Catholic faith of the Church of England, which, in all fundamentals concerning the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, sin, redemption, justification, holiness of inward experience and outward practice, the Church and sacraments, the future with its issues, and the Holy Scriptures, which are the infallible depository and standard of all these doctrines, is held by the Methodists with a unanimity, tenacity, and resistance to innovation that affords an example to the Mother Church herself. As to the entire body of

strictly evangelical truth, and setting aside certain points of order and discipline, Methodism is, as a whole, far more faithful than the Church of England to the teaching of the fathers and founders of the Anglican Church.

"In this fact we cannot but rejoice; if our protest seems to savor of self-gratification and boasting, we are compelled to it by the studied silences of such essays as those of the Bampton Lecturer. We will be bold, and say yet more. There cannot be found in Christendom a community which, by the grace of God, is more faithful to that summary of truth which is universally acknowledged to contain the principles of the regeneration and life of the world. Methodism, whether in England, or in the universal dominions of England, or in America, has never given birth to a heresy; some few faint appearances of a tendency to unsettle the foundations of doctrine as to the person of Christ have been instantly and thoroughly repressed; and with regard to points of less importance than that, the sensitiveness of the community has been so vigilant that the originators of views out of harmony with the common faith have been compelled to retire. It is needless here to discuss the nature of the doctrinal tests that have been so rigorously employed; nor is it necessary to inquire into the grounds of this steadfast uniformity of doctrine. The fact is evident, and it is a most remarkable one. Year after year, hundreds of young men are sent out into the ministry at home and abroad, the soundness of whose faith may, generally speaking, be relied on. The annual Conferences of Methodism in various parts of the world exhibit the spectacle of some thousands of pastors who are of one accord and of one mind as to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; so perfectly of one mind, that any serious variation from the truth on the part of any one of these thousands would surely lead to his separation from the teaching ministry. This is a fact that perhaps has no strict parallel in the Christendom of the present day. And it ought to be known, and taken into account, by any writer who makes the doctrinal relations of Methodism to the Church of England, or to the Church universal, his study."

British Quarterly Review, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Goths at Ravenna. 2. Immortality. 3. Our Railway System. 4. The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. 5. The Present Phase of Prehistoric Archæology. 6. Sir Henry Lawrence.

The Fifth Article of this able organ of the English Independents strenuously maintains the reality of the Palæolithic Man as far back as, perhaps, the pre-glacial age of England, unmeasured millions of years ago.

Our readers may recall that in a late number we gave an abridgment of an Article on the Palæolithic and Neolithic ages. It maintained that the Neolithic flint-stones were genuine artificial implements, but within the Mosaic chronology; while the Palæolithic were of no human workmanship. The following is the statement of the present writer touching

THE PALÆOLITHIC PERIOD AND ITS IMPLEMENTS:

"The rudely-chipped flint implements, discovered in the river gravels of France, Germany, and Britain, prove the existence of man in North-western Europe at a time so remote from the present that some valleys, such as that of the Somme, have been cut down by the existing rivers to a depth of from eighty to a hundred feet in the interval. And the bones associated with them in the same strata show that the fauna differed materially from that now living in Europe. The lion, for example, which in the days of Herodotus lived in the mountains of Thrace in sufficient numbers to descend in bands to prey upon the baggage camels of Xerxes, then ranged through France, Germany, and Britain; and the spotted hyena, which is now found only in Southern Africa, was found in abundance as far north as Yorkshire, and from the pillars of Hercules as far east as the frontiers of Russia. The grizzly bear of the Rocky Mountains extended as far to the south-west as the shores of the Mediterranean; and the musk sheep, which at present dwells in the inclement region of the extreme north of America, lived in Europe as far south as a line passing through the Alps and the Pyrenees. Among the extinct animals, the more important are the great hairy rhinoceros, the mammoth, the Irish elk, and the gigantic cave-bear. To this strange group of animals must be added all those wild species which still inhabit Europe, and among them the reindeer and the bison were incredibly abundant. The flint implements

which prove that man formed part of this fauna, indicate that he was in the lowest stage of culture; *so rude, indeed, are they, and so unlike those which are at present in use among savage tribes, that it is impossible to make out for what purpose they were employed. We may indeed rather ask, with Sir John Lubbock, 'To what need of savage life could they not be applied?' Besides the larger forms, which for want of better names are known as spear-heads and sling-stones, flint-scrapers are found, which from their analogy* with those of the Esquimaux must certainly have been used in preparing hides, as well as flint-awls for boring holes and flint-flakes for cutting purposes. This short list exhausts all the known forms of flint implements which have been furnished by the ancient deposits of rivers; and it tells us little but the mere fact that savage tribes lived in France and Britain while the strata which geologists term pleistocene or quaternary were being accumulated. It is impossible to bring their makers into relation with any races living at the present day."

This admission of the vague character of the implements seems to confirm the argument against the reality of the paleolithic man. The writer gives us the following

TOPOGRAPHY OF THE PALÆOLITHIC AGE.

"The conditions under which palæolithic men lived in Europe were very different from those under which we live. On the one hand, the mainland extended to the north-west far into the Atlantic, and Britain and Ireland were united to the mainland, the English Channel and the North Sea being low valleys, through which great rivers flowed, of which the Thames, Rhine, and Severn are merely the smaller branches. In the South of Europe, also, the geography was altogether different, the mainland of Africa being joined to Spain, and a barrier of land extending from Tunis to Southern Italy. Candia also was joined to Greece, and the area of the Mediterranean was reduced to two or three landlocked basins, the positions of which are discovered by the deeper soundings. We can therefore understand why at this time African animals, such as the elephant, the hippopotamus, and spotted hyena, should have found their way into Europe. The very substitution also of a mass of land such as this for a stretch of sea would cause

the climatal extremes to be more strongly marked than at the present time. The summer heat and the winter cold in Central Europe somewhat resembled that of Siberia, and to this may be attributed the strange association of northern and southern animals, such as the hippopotamus and the reindeer, in the area extending from the Alps and Pyrenees to the Baltic. To the north of this the temperature was probably arctic, and to the south it was probably warmer than it is now. In the middle area *mers de glace* occupied certain isolated districts, such as Ireland, the greater part of Scotland, Wales, Lancashire, and Yorkshire, Auvergne and the Pyrenees."

The writer identifies the palæolithic races of Auvergne in France and some other localities with the Esquimaux.

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews. 1873. First Number.) *Essays:* 1. GOTTSCHICK, The Visible and the Indivisible Church—on what this Distinction is based, and what Holy Writ teaches concerning it. 2. ROSCH, The Jesus-Myths of Judaism. *Remarks:* 1. MICHELSEN, On Five Important Passages of the New Testament, concerning the Relation of the Gentiles to the Kingdom of God and to the Gospel. 2. KOSTLIN, The Controversy on the Birth-year of Luther. 3. LINDNER, On Hutten's Book: De Schismate Extinguendo. *Reviews:* 1. KLEINERT, Deuteronomy, reviewed by RIEHM. 2. HOLLENBERG, Contributions to Christian Knowledge, reviewed by BESSER. 3. SIEFFERT, The Apologetic Foundations of the science of Christian Faith, reviewed by SCHMIDT.

The introduction to this first number of the new year informs us that in the place of Dr. Hundeshagen, deceased, Dr. Köstlin, of Halle, has become one of the editors-in-chief of this veteran theological quarterly. The theological standpoint of the *Studien* will remain unchanged; it will defend a theology which will steadfastly adhere to the faith of the Apostles and the Reformers, but at the same time endeavor to find for it a new scientific form, in accordance with the consciousness of the living age.

The article by Rösch discusses all the Jewish traditions on the life of Jesus, as they have been collected in the well-known works of Wagenseil, Lightfoot, Eisenmenger, and Schöttgen. It traces the history of each of these traditions, and tries to explain how they may have originated.

As appears from the article of Dr. Köstlin, the controversy of the German theological periodicals on the birth-year of

Luther is not yet closed. Dr. Köstlin comes to the conclusion that we are as yet unable to decide either in favor of the year 1483, which was formerly generally regarded as the birth-year of the great reformer, or whether the year 1484 has more in its favor.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE, (Journal for Historical Theology.) 1873. First Number. 1. GORRES, Critical Researches on the Insurrection and the Martyrdom of the Visigothic Prince Hermenigild. 2. BRANDES, A Sect of Quakers in Westphalia.

The history of Arianism in the Spanish kingdoms established by the Visigoths and other German tribes has been elaborately treated in quite a number of recent German works. Among the older works Aschbach's History of the Visigoths, (*Geschichte der Westgothen*, 1827,) was especially valuable; among those of a more recent date the "History of Arianism" and the "Law of the Visigoths," by Helferich; the "Kings of the Germans," (*Könige der Germanen*,) by Felix Dahn, the "Manual of German Antiquities," (*Handbuch deutscher Alterthümer*,) by George Pfahler, the history of "Gregory of Tours" by Giesebrecht, have awakened a new interest in the subject. The article by Dr. Franz Görres, in the above number of the Journal for Historical Theology, treats of the history of the last Arian king of the Visigoths, Leovigild, (from 569 to 586,) and in particular of the rebellion of the king's eldest son, Hermenigild, who had joined the Roman communion against his father, and of his final overthrow and execution. The history of this war is an interesting illustration of the want of patriotism which generally has been shown in history by the Catholic subjects of non-Catholic Governments. The rebellion of the Catholic prince was so utterly unjustifiable that even the Catholic writers of those times severely censure it; nevertheless, he was supported by most of the Catholics, Bishops and clergy, and a large portion of the Catholic population, for no other reason than because they hoped he would overthrow the power of an Arian ruler. The Pope subsequently canonized the rebel, notwithstanding the unfavorable opinion which even the contemporaneous writers of the Catholic Church had expressed with regard to him, and ultramontane Church historians, like Cardinal Baronius (*Annal.*

Eccles., vii, p. 656, ed. Antwerp) and the Spaniard, Antonio de Yepes, expressed the monstrous opinion that Hermenigild was right in taking up arms against his heretical father, as "a Catholic must love his religion more than parents, honor, glory, and life." The author of the article, Dr. Görres, appears to have made the history of Spanish Arianism a special study. Besides his article on Hermenigild, he has published another article on the beginning of the reign of King Leovigild, in the historical periodical *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, 1872, and he announces a special monograph on the "Relation of the Visigothic king Leovigild to Catholicism and to the Arian State Church."

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) 1873. First Number.—1. HILGENFELD, The Epistle of James. 2. GRIMM, On Philippians 6–11. 3. HINSCH, Researches on the Epistle to the Philippians. 4. HOLTZMANN, Lucas and Josephus. 5. HITZIG, Belthis. 6. O. L., Nathanael. 7. HILGENFELD, John in Asia Minor.

Probably the most novel among the many novel assertions which this organ of the Rationalistic theologians of Germany is wont to make is the contribution in the above number on Nathanael. The author of the article, who merely signs his name O. L., undertakes to prove that the Nathanael mentioned in the fourth Gospel (i, 40–52) is the Apostle Paul. The argumentation in support of this strange opinion is as weak as it is novel.

In the last article Professor Hilgenfeld defends the Johannean origin of the Revelation against a new work by Professor Scholten, of Leyden. (*Der Apostle Johannes in Kleinasien.* Berlin. 1872.)

ART. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF OLD CATHOLICS.—On September 20, 21, and 22, the Second Congress of the Old Catholics was held at Cologne. Whatever opinion different religious parties may hold of the doctrinal system and the future of this new religious organization of Germany, it is agreed on all sides that this Second Congress by far exceeded in importance the First, which was held one year ago at Munich, and that it must be regarded as one of the most memorable ecclesiastical assemblies of the

year 1872. Dean Stanley, of Westminster, who attended it, is quoted as having said that never in his life had he been present at a meeting when the great religious questions of the day had been discussed with greater ability. All the leaders of the movement were present, and the invitations which had been sent to representative men of other Churches had been accepted by many. Among those who, by letters addressed to the Congress, expressed their sympathies with its labors, were the Anglican Bishop of Lichfield, Professor Pusey and Canon Liddon, of Oxford, Beresford Hope, Professor Ossinin, of St. Petersburg, the Italian Senator Terenzio Mamiani, Dr. Prato, member of the Austrian Reichsrath, Dr. Völk and Baron Stauffenberg, members of the German Reichsrath, Priest Aguayo, of Madrid, and the Patriarch of the Catholic Armenians. Professor Schulte was elected President of the Second Congress, as he had been of the First. The proceedings consisted of meetings of delegates, and of public meetings, in which the most prominent members of the Congress made addresses on the questions which are chiefly agitated in the new religious movement. The meetings of delegates were attended by more than four hundred members. Among those who took part in these meetings were the Old Catholic (Jansenist) Archbishop Loos, of Utrecht; the Anglican Bishops Wordsworth, of Lincoln, Browne, of Ely, and Whittingham, of Maryland; Dean Stanley, of Westminster; Professors John Wordsworth and W. Talbot, of Oxford; Rev. Mr. May, of London, (the representative of the Bishop of London;) Archpriest Yanyschev, Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg; Alexander Kirejev, Adjutant of the Grand Duke Constantine, and Secretary of the Association of the Friends of Enlightenment in St. Petersburg; Rev. Chauncy Langdon, of Florence, (who for many years has been laboring in Italy for the establishment of friendly relations between the Church of England and the reform party in the Catholic Church of Italy;) Rev. R. S. Nevin, rector of the American chapel in Rome; Abbé Michaud and E. de Pressensé, of Paris; Professors Döllinger, Friedrick, Huber, and Cornelius, of Munich; Maassen, of Vienna; Reinkens, of Breslau; Knoodt, Reusch, and Langen, of Bonn; Herzog, of Lucerne; Lutterbeck, of Giessen; Michelis, of Braunsberg; Dr. Hasenclever, member of the German Reichsrath; and Professor Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, (one of the leaders of the Protestantenverein of Germany.) Most of the priests who have joined the Old Catholic movement were present, with a number of professors of gymnasia, of members of town councils and the high judiciary.

In his opening speech the President of the Congress, Professor Schulte, gave a comprehensive review of the history of the Old Catholic movement, and of its present situation. The Old Catholic movement had been begun by men who were Catholics, and wished to remain Catholics, and who on that account refused to recognize doctrines which until recently had been entirely unknown and foreign to the Catholic Church. As all, or nearly all, of the bishops had submitted to the innovation, they had no tribunal before which a suit could be instituted against the Bishop of Rome and the other episcopal innovators, and as the large majority of

the lower clergy had followed the bishops in their apostasy from the true Catholic faith, many of the faithful Catholics were unable to attend divine service and to discharge their religious duties. Thus the Old Catholics were compelled to provide for the establishment of divine worship in their congregations, and, as the Catholic system recognizes the episcopate, to provide for the election of bishops. All the Old Catholics desired far-going reforms in their Church, and to resume the labors which to that end had been made during the last five centuries. But the proper organs for carrying out these reforms were diocesan, provincial, and Œcumenical Synods. So long as these Synods of the Old Catholic Church were not organized, they must be content with abrogating some glaring abuses which individual congregations have a right to deal with. In the meanwhile they would stand on the ground of the positive Christian faith, as it was contained in the Scriptures, and as it was explained by the first seven Œcumenical Councils.

Addresses were then made by the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishop of Lincoln, after which the discussion on the plan of the organization of Old Catholic congregations, as proposed by a special committee, was begun. This plan, which, in fourteen paragraphs, carries out the principles indicated in the opening speech of the President, was adopted with only one verbal modification. One of these paragraphs declares that as long as the Old Catholics of Germany have no bishop belonging to the Old Catholic faith, the bishops of the Church of Utrecht (the Jansenists) and the Armenian Church will be asked for the performance of the episcopal functions—in particular of the administration of the sacraments of confirmation and ordination; that, however, the Old Catholics of Germany reserve to themselves the right of re-establishing a regular episcopal jurisdiction by the election of bishops, who are to be chosen by the Old Catholic priests and the representatives of the Old Catholic congregations, and who are at the beginning to labor like the missionary bishops of the ancient Church. The abolition of celibacy, which was demanded by one delegate, was declared not to fall within the competency of this Congress, but the legislation on it was reserved for the authoritative organs of the Church, that is to say, the future bishops and Synods. For the same reason a notion to recognize only the first seven Œcumenical Councils as true councils was almost unanimously voted down.

The Archpriest Tanyschev, of St. Petersburg, expressed his delight with the course of the Old Catholics, and in particular with the resolutions to adhere to the faith and constitution of the ancient Church, and to leave the carrying through of the needed reforms to the lawful authority of the Church. The main point of difference between the Greek and the Latin Churches he declared to be that the well-known addition of *Filioque* to the creed of the universal Church, as agreed upon by a council of the whole Church, had been onesidedly adopted by the Latin Church, without the consent of the Greek. He advocated the just rights of different nationalities within the Church, and, on the other hand, dwelt on the importance of the truly Œcumenical Councils of the entire Church,

and he called on the representatives of Catholic theology in Germany to labor in union with the theologians of the Greek Church for a scientific investigation of Christian truth, in the interest of a final reunion of the Churches.

A committee of seven members was appointed to make all the necessary preparations for the election of a bishop, and to draw a provisional constitution of Old Catholic congregations. It consists of three theologians, (Friedrich, Michelis, and Reusch,) two professors of canon law, (Maassen and Schulte,) and two other laymen. Another committee, of which Professor Döllinger is the chairman, and which has the right of cooperation, is to enter into communication with other Christian Churches about a reunion of the different branches of Christianity. And, with regard to this point, it was emphatically declared that the Old Catholics of Germany looked for a closer union not only with the Anglican and Greek Churches, with which they agree in most points of doctrines and of constitution, but also with the evangelical Protestants.

The Congress next discussed and adopted a series of resolutions relative to the legal condition of the Old Catholics. These resolutions demand that the State Governments recognize the Old Catholics as the sole representatives of the Catholic Church of Germany, because they alone professed the principle of the Catholic Church as it existed up to 1870, and as it had regulated its affairs by agreement with the State. They therefore demand the legal recognition of the Old Catholic bishops and priests by the State, and the payment of their salaries by the State, in accordance with the existing laws. They announce that the Old Catholics intend to establish before the German courts their claims to the property of the Catholic Church. They also represent the general introduction of the obligatory civil marriage as absolutely necessary.

For the present management and the further extension of the Old Catholic movement two central committees were appointed, one at Cologne for northern, and one at Munich for southern Germany. Switzerland already has a central committee of its own, and another will be appointed for the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

The most important work of the Congress is undoubtedly the provision for the appointment of one or several bishops, which will take place in the course of the coming year. Then only it can be found out whether the new Church has vitality enough to grow.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

The rupture between the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople and the Bulgarian nation (see "Methodist Quarterly Review," 1872, p. 329) became complete by the election, in March, 1872, of Bishop Anthim as Exarch, or head of the national Bulgarian Church. The Exarch at once made efforts to bring about an understanding with the Patriarch. The latter replied that he would give a respite of forty days, after the lapse of which he must return to the orthodox Church, and during which he must abstain from exercising any episcopal function, under penalty of

the canonical law. The Exarch indeed abstained from all ecclesiastical functions, although the Passover of the Greek Church took place within this period. But in the latter part of May the Exarch yielded to the pressure brought upon him by the leaders of the national Bulgarian party, and solemnly released the three Bulgarian bishops who, in January, 1872, had been excommunicated by the Patriarch, from the excommunication. This induced the Patriarch to convoke a meeting of his synod and of many prominent laymen, which declared the negotiations with the Bulgarians to be at an end, and Anthim to have incurred the canonical censures. On the other side, the Exarch, on May 24, left out in the liturgy the prescribed mention of the Patriarch, and substituted for it the words "the orthodox episcopate," which immediately called forth the reading of a pastoral letter by the Patriarch, excommunicating Anthim, and pronouncing the great anathema against the three Bulgarian bishops. Notwithstanding these measures, the Bulgarian Church consolidated itself more and more. The Exarch soon consecrated a new bishop, and at Wodina, in Macedonia, the Bulgarians expelled the Greek bishop, and declared that, in accordance with Article X of the firman establishing the Bulgarian exarchate, (by which article it is provided that two thirds of the inhabitants of a diocese have the power of demanding the connection of the diocese with the exarchate,) they would join the Bulgarian Church. On September 10 the "Great Synod" of the Church met in Constantinople. All the Patriarchs and twenty-five archbishops and bishops were present. The Synod soon declared "phyletism," that is, the distinction of races and nationalities within the Church of God, as contrary to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Fathers, and excluded six Bulgarian bishops and all connected with the exarchate from the Church. All the bishops signed the decree except the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who left the Synod before its close, and was therefor insulted by the Greek population of Smyrna, in Asia Minor, who received him with shouts of "Traitor!" "Muscovite!" The following is a translation of the decree of the Synod, which will remain an important document in the annals of the Greek Church:

"Decree of the Holy and Grand Council, assembled at Constantinople in the month of September, in the year of grace 1872. The Apostle Paul has commanded us to take heed unto ourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers, to govern the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood; and has at the same time predicted that grievous wolves shall enter among us, not sparing the flock, and that of our own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them; and he has warned us to beware of such. We have learned with astonishment and pain that such men have lately appeared among the Bulgarian people within the jurisdiction of the Holy Œcumenical Throne. They have dared to introduce into the Church the idea of phyletism, or the national Church, which is of the temporal life, and have established, in contempt of the sacred canon, an unauthorized and unprecedented Church assem-

bly, based upon the principle of the difference of races. Being inspired in accordance with our duty, by zeal for God and the wish to protect the pious Bulgarian people against the spread of this evil, we have met in the name of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Having first besought from the depths of our hearts the grace of the Father of light, and consulted the Gospel of Christ, in which all treasures of wisdom are hidden, and having examined the principles of phyletism with reference to the precepts of the Gospel and the temporal constitution of the Church of God, we have found it not only foreign, but in enmity to them, and have perceived that the unlawful acts committed by the aforesaid unauthorized phyletismal assembly, as they were severally recited to us, are one and all condemned.

"Therefore, in view of the sacred canons, whose rulings are hereby confirmed in their whole compass; in view of the teachings of the apostles, through whom the Holy Ghost has spoken; in view of the decrees of the seven Œcumenical Councils, and of all the local councils; in view of the definitions of the Fathers of the Church, we ordain as follows: ART. 1. We censure, condemn, and declare contrary to the teachings of the Gospel and the sacred canons of the holy Fathers the doctrine of phyletism, or of the difference of races and national diversity in the bosom of the Church of Christ. ART. 2. We declare the adherents of phyletism, who have had the boldness to set up an unlawful, unprecedented Church assembly upon such a principle, to be foreign and absolutely schismatic to the only holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. There are and remain, therefore, schismatic and foreign to the Orthodox Church the following lawless men who have of their own free will separated themselves from it, namely, Hilarion, ex-Bishop of Makariopolis; Panaretes, ex-Metropolitan of Philippopolis; Hilarion, ex-Bishop of Sostra; Anthimos, ex-Metropolitan of Widdin; Dorothea, ex-Metropolitan of Sophia; Partheonius, ex-Metropolitan of Nyssava; Gennadius, ex-Metropolitan of Melissa, before deposed and excommunicated; together with all who have been ordained by them to be archbishops, priests, and deacons; all persons, spiritual and worldly, who are in communion with them; all who act in co-operation with them; and all who accept as lawful and canonical their unholy blessings and ceremonies of worship. While we pronounce this synodal decision, we pray to the God of mercy, our Lord Jesus Christ, the head and founder of our faith, that he will preserve his holy Church from all dangerous new doctrines, and that he will keep it pure, spotless, and fast, on the foundations of the apostles and the prophets. We pray him to grant the grace of repentance to those who have separated themselves from her, and have founded their unauthorized Church assembly upon the principle of phyletism, so that they may some day nullify their acts, and return to the only holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, in order with all the orthodox to praise God, who came upon the earth to bring peace and good-will to all men. He it is whom we shall honor and worship, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, to the end of time. Amen."

The decree is signed by his Grace the Œcumenical Patriarch and the three former Patriarchs, the Pontiff and Patriarch of Alexandria, the Patriarch of Antioch, the Archbishop of Cyprus, and by twenty-five metropolitans and bishops.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A work by Professor Maassen, of Vienna, on the "History of the Sources and the Literature of the Canon Law in the West up to the End of the Middle Ages," (*Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechtes im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters.* Gratz, 1872,) is on all sides praised as a work of superior merit. The author, originally a Lutheran, joined some years ago the Roman Catholic Church, but is now one of the most gifted leaders of the Old Catholic movement.

Another prominent leader of the Old Catholics, Professor Lutterbeck, of the University of Giessen, has, in a monograph on The Clementines, (*Die Clementinen.* Giessen, 1872,) a book falsely ascribed to Bishop Clement, of Rome, undertaken to prove that the doctrine of infallibility, as well as that of the absolute power now claimed by the Popes, had its origin in this book, which, in the author's opinion, was compiled about the year 135. Heretofore most writers have regarded the second half of the second century as the time in which this book originated. Its spurious character is now almost universally admitted; only among the Ultramontane writers of Italy, France, and other Papal countries, there are occasionally found writers who have not heard of the modern investigations.

The Lutheran theologians of Germany continue to discuss the question of a Millennium. The millennial hope that the Jews, according to the biblical prophecies, will finally be converted and will be again gathered in Palestine, when, by the second appearance of Christ, they will be delivered from the hands of their enemies and establish a theocratic rule over all nations, has found a new champion in the Rev. A. Koch, (*Das Tausendjährige Reich.* Basel, 1872.) The author endeavors, in particular, to refute the arguments adduced against the doctrine of a Millennium by Hengstenberg, Keil, and Klieforth.

An important exegetical work on the Gospel of Mark and its relation to Matthew and Luke has been published by Prof. Weiss, (*Das Marcus evangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen.* Berlin, 1872.) The author undertakes to prove that the Gospel of Mark was written before Matthew and Luke, but that prior to any of the three Gospels in their present form there was a brief record of the sermons of Jesus and of historical narratives, which Papias attributes to Matthew.

The work of Professor Köstlin on "The Doctrine of the Christian

Church according to the New Testament, and with Particular Reference to the Points Controverted between Protestants and Roman Catholics," has recently appeared in a second edition, (*Das Wesen der Kirche.* Gotha, 1872.) A point of special interest in this new edition is the discussion of the doctrinal bearing of the recent events in the Roman Catholic Church, and, in particular, of the views advanced in the addresses of Dr. Döllinger on the reunion of the Christian Church.

The highly-valued edition of the apologetic writers of the second century of the Christian Church, by Professor Otto, of Vienna, has been completed by the appearance of the ninth volume, (*Corpus Apologetarum christianorum sæculi secundi*, vol. ix. Jena, 1872.) This last volume contains the work of Hermias against the pagan philosophers and writings and fragments of writings of the Athenian Quadratus, of Aristides, of Aristo of Pella, of Melito of Sardes, and of Claudius Apollinaris.

Our knowledge of the ancient history of the Jews has been so much enriched by the discoveries of the Assyrian inscriptions that a special work on the relations of these discoveries to the Old Testament was highly needed. No more competent man could have undertaken to write on this subject than Dr. Schrader, Professor of Theology at Jena, (formerly of Giessen,) whose new work, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, ("The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament." Giessen, 1872,) supplies all the information which those interested in the subject can desire. Professor Schrader is favorably known as a writer on the subject, and has in particular published a number of valuable articles in the *Studien und Kritiken*, to which the *Methodist Quarterly Review* has several times called attention. In the above work the author discusses all the passages of the Old Testament which are elucidated or explained by the cuneiform inscriptions, and then undertakes to establish a system of Hebrew and Assyrian chronology. Several appendixes give lists of Assyrian rulers, lists of administrations, a glossary of Assyrian words, and other interesting matter; and the use of the work is greatly facilitated by accurate registers, the key to the new chronological information which has been gathered from the Assyrian inscriptions to the discovery of the so-called "lists of Eponyms." Eponyms is the name which has been chosen for designating an officer in Nineveh who was elected annually, and who gave the name to the current year; every important occurrence of the year, as the wars and victories of the kings, the accession to the throne, the contracts of the merchants, etc., being called after him. On account of their similarity with the Athenian Archontes, they are also sometimes called Archontes. Now, of these Eponyms or Archontes we have complete lists from 900 to 600 B. C.; and as a tablet of king Sardanapal IV. fixes the year of the Eponym Purelsalche (under whose successor king Tiglath-pileser succeeded to the throne) by means of a solar eclipse which astronomers have shown to have taken place on June 15, 763 B. C., we have for the whole series of Eponyms, as well as for the kings whose names are mentioned in their lists, dates which are indisputably correct. It is apparent of what immense signifi-

cance these discoveries must be for the establishment of a correct chronology of the Old Testament. It may still be mentioned that the reading of the Assyrian texts is now regarded by Orientalists generally as being almost completely certain. Besides the former Assyrian grammars by Oppert and Ménant, we have now a work, regarded as exhaustive, by Professor Schrader, entitled *Die Assyrisch-babylonischen Keilinschriften*, ("The Assyro-Babylonian Cuneiform Inscriptions—Critical Researches on the Bases of their Deciphering; together with the Babylonian Text of the Trilingual Inscription, with a Translation and Glossary." Leipsic, 1872.)

A new manual of pedagogics, (*Allgemeine Pädagogik.* Vienna, 1872,) by Dr. E. Böhl, professor of the Faculty of Evangelical Theology at Vienna, is generally designated as a very interesting contribution to the educational literature of Germany.

The comprehensive work on Church Law (*Kirchenrecht*, vol. vii. Ratisbon, 1872,) by Professor Georg Philips, of Vienna, has, soon after the appearance of the seventh volume, been interrupted by the death of its author, which occurred on September 6, 1872, at Aigen, near Salzburg. Professor Philips, born in 1804, was the son of an English merchant at Konigsberg; became, in 1826, professor at the University of Berlin; joined, in 1828, the Roman Catholic Church; accepted, in 1833, a call to the Catholic University of Munich, and was rector of that University when the notorious Lola Montez caused the overthrow of the Catholic ministry and the dismissal of eight Catholic professors of the University, of which he himself was one. In 1848 he was a member of the German Parliament of Frankfort; in 1849 he became professor of the Austrian University of Insbruck, and in 1851 of that of Vienna. Soon after he was also appointed Aulic Counselor (Hofrath) and member of the Academy of Sciences. He was regarded as one of the leaders of the Ultramontane party, and was several times chosen president of the annual meetings of the Catholic associations of Germany.

A very thorough and instructive monograph on the "Doctrine of the Logos in Greek Philosophy" (*Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie.* Oldenburg, 1872) has been published by M. Henze. The author traces the history of this important doctrine from its author, the pantheistic Heraclitus, of Ephesus, through the systems of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, to the Apocrypha of the Old Testament and Philo, and concludes with the opinions of Neo-Platonism. The historical development of the doctrine of the Logos in Christian theology the author leaves to theologians.

FRANCE.

The most important work of the Syriac literature, the ecclesiastical chronicles of Barhebraeus, is now being published in Brussels by J. B. Abbeloos and Th. J. Lamy, (*Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon eccles.* Brussels, 1872.) The edition contains, besides the Syriac text, a Latin trans-

lation. At the same time the grammatical works of Barhebraeus have been published at Paris by Abbé Martin, (*Œuvres gramm. de Barhebraeus.* 2 vols. Paris, 1872.)

One of the most prominent men of the Reformed Church of France, Eugene Bersier, has published a history of the General Synod of his Church which was held last year to take up again, after an interruption of two hundred and twelve years, the work of the former Synods of the Church, (*Histoire du Synode Générale de l'Eglise Reformée de France.* Paris, 1872.) The book contains a historical introduction which acquaints the reader with the past history of the Reformed Church, and with the causes which have produced the present situation of French Protestantism; the public proceedings of the Synod, with all the speeches made; an appendix, containing a collection of important documents relative to the history of the Church, such as the Confession of Faith of La Rochelle, the Discipline of the Reformed Church, the important Laws of 1802 and 1852, and the circulars of the Government explaining them; a brief summary of the history and the decisions of former Synods, the statistics of the Protestant population of France, a statistical account of the limits into which the Church is divided, the draft of the new Organical Law which has been adopted by the Synod, and much other important and interesting matter.

ITALY.

The papal almanac, which formerly was entitled *Annuano Pontificio*, has been published for 1872 under the title *La Gerarchia cattolica e la famiglia pontificia.* This almanac was formerly regarded as a kind of official publication of the Pope, and Catholic periodicals did, therefore, not dare to find fault with it. This year the compiler, Monsignor Ciccolini, appears to indicate in his preface that the almanac is not to be considered as official; and even the Catholic papers do, therefore, admit that the almanac leaves much to be desired, both in point of completeness and in point of accuracy. The almanac, in fact, contains nothing but a list of the cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and other high dignitaries of the Catholic Church and of the papal court. It contains no statistical information on the present number of Roman Catholics.

The public addresses which Pope Pius IX. has made since September 20, 1870, (the downfall of the temporal power,) have been published under the name *Discorsi del Sommo Pontefice Pio IX.*, ("Discourses of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX., Pronounced in the Vatican to the Faithful of Rome and of the Earth, from the Beginning of his Imprisonment until the Present Day. Collected for the first time, and published by P. Don Pasquale de Franciscis." Rome, 1872.) A collection like this has a certain interest for the Church history of our age, for it is a faithful mirror of the sentiments animating the papal court at one of the greatest crises in the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

Professor M. Haug, of Munich, the best authority on all subjects relating to the religion of the Parsees, has published an essay on the "Ahuna-vairya Formula, the Holiest Prayer of the Zoroastrians," (*Die Ahuna-vairya-Formel.* Munich, 1872.) This prayer, which consists of hardly twenty words, is described as the eternal word of Ahuramazda, which existed before all creation, by which the world was created, and which is the substance of all good powers, terrestrial and spiritual. As to the meaning of the formula, the writers on the Zend language are not fully agreed. The translation which is given by Professor Haug (who for many years lived in India in literary intercourse with the Parsees) materially differs from one recently given by Professor R. Roth in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxv, pp. 14–21. According to Haug, the chief aim of the formula is to inculcate to every Zoroastrian the necessity of spiritual assistance and spiritual direction. The formula very frequently occurs in the sacred writings of the Parsees, and in the entire religious literature of the Zoroastrians. As the most powerful prayer, as the most effective magic formula, it is used in all occurrences of life, even in many of the most common occupations, but chiefly in religious ceremonies and performances. Thus it is used one hundred and twenty-one times in the libation of the consecrated wine and the consecrated fruit.

Among the great number of books and pamphlets which have recently been published on the present relation of the Roman Catholic Church to the State Government, one by Gerlach on "Pope and Emperor" (*Kaiser und Papst.* Berlin, 1872) attracts considerable attention because the aged author has long been one of the leaders of the High Church conservatism of Prussia. He is one of the very few Protestant writers who assert that the proclamation of the infallibility and absolute power of the Popes by the Vatican Council should neither affect the friendly relations between the State Government and the Papal Court, nor the alliance between High Church Protestants and Romanists against the liberal tendencies of the age.

Art. IX.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A Theodicy; or, Vindication of the Divine Glory, as Manifested in the Constitution and Government of the Moral World. By Albert Taylor Bledsoe, LL.D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

This "Theodicy" was written when the author was in the strength and ambition of his earlier manhood. His moral nature had not been put to the strain by advocating an institution the reverse of freedom, nor his feelings embittered by overwhelming disaster in his advocacy. The work is, therefore, manly and courteous in its spirit; pure, clear, and stately in its diction; richly freighted with

an immense amount of reading of the grand old masters of moral thought; and penetrative, demonstrative, and, in a great degree, original in the structure of its great argument. It will long stand, we trust, as a stronghold of a true theology; it never will be or can be fairly answered. To the large, but we fear not increasing, number of our ministry and laity who possess an interest in mastering the philosophy of our theology we cheerfully recommend the thorough study of our New Edition of this work.

To sustain its title for originality it is not necessary to claim that its fundamental positions are original. In a modest passage of his Introduction he says: "We do not wish to be understood as laying claim to the discovery of any great truth, or any new principle. Yet we do trust that we have attained to a clear and precise statement of old truths. And these truths, thus clearly defined, we trust that we have seized with a firm grasp, and carried as lights through the dark places of theology, so as to expel thence the errors and delusions by which its glory has been obscured. Moreover, if we have not succeeded, nor even attempted to succeed, in solving any mysteries, properly so called, yet may we have removed certain apparent contradictions, which have been usually deemed insuperable to the human mind." All this, and more, may be rightly accorded to the author. Yet on the other hand, in answering the objection (which no Methodist would bring) that he has presented a "new theology" he somehow admits and justifies. His truer and more conclusive reply would have been that as a structural "theology" there is nothing "new" about it. And so when he claims (p. 244) that Arminians are ignorant of the key-principle of his Argument, he claims what no well-read Arminian will ever concede to his work. It is simply a restatement of the old Chrysostomian-Arminian theodicy, embraced within the theology of the entire Eastern Church, of a large majority of the Western Church, and, in fact, of the entire Christian Church of the first three centuries. There is not a leading idea in this work by the side of which we might not place its duplicate in some preceding author, and, probably, many authors.*

* In noticing our refutation of Dr. Bledsoe's three charges against us individually of having plagiarized his Theodicy, the editor of the "Canada Christian Guardian" conceded the validity of our replies; yet he was pleased to add (we quote from memory, but, we think, correctly) that, in his opinion, we had not done sufficient justice to Dr. Bledsoe; that his own opinion of the Theodicy was higher than ours, and that he had himself received great benefit from its perusal. How the respected editor should know that our opinion of the work was lower than his he would be nonplussed to tell, as we have heretofore published no opinion of it

The work is divided into two parts. Part First seeks to reconcile the Existence of Sin, and Part Second the Existence of Suffering, with the Holiness of God. For the entire series of solutions through both parts, one great leading principle, firmly grasped and persistently applied, serves as the *key*. That key-principle is *the impossibility of a necessitated holiness*. In the very nature of things, holiness is the attribute of a free-agent. The non-existence of the freedom is the non-existence of the holiness. The production of a system of purely holy agents without the attribute of a non-necessitated free-agency is as impossible, even to Omnipotence, as a system of circles without the equality of the radii. This single key-principle unlocks a whole series of iron doors of the stern stronghold of Necessity. It enables us to emerge into the sphere of a genuine free-agency, in which the universe, though abounding in sin and suffering, is still seen as the best possible system, and as ruled by a perfectly wise and holy God.

Yet, as we have frankly said in our work on The Will, the terms in which this key-formula is expressed appear to us in an important point inaccurate. In the list of noble authors quoted in the work no Wesleyan-Arminian writer appears. This is deeply to be regretted. Theodicy, as included in theology, was really the field of that notable controversy which called forth those memorable expositions by Wesley, Fletcher, and others, to which the central part of Watson's Institutes was a grand addition. Theodicy in its connection with the other parts of theology was never so clearly, evangelically, practically, and conclusively developed as by these great Wesleyan masters. The author of this Theodicy would have

whatever. The work has never been before us for characterization; not in our Quarterly, for it has never before presented itself to us for notice; not in our "Will," for no author whatever, excepting Edwards in the Preface, is characterized in that work any more than in Dr. Bledsoe's own book. If the editor has derived benefit from its perusal, that rendered it his duty to do it justice, not ours, who owed it no obligations. And that we owed it no obligations is conclusively conceded by the editor when he admits that Dr. Bledsoe has picked his three test passages to prove our indebtedness, and has failed. How, then, are we called upon to do justice when we have incurred no obligation? We have ever in private intercourse recommended the work; and at the time the courteous editor of "The Guardian" was writing, our own copy was lent to a young minister to whom we had strongly advised its study. We may add that while Dr. Bledsoe was preparing his broadsides upon us personally we were doing our best to urge the issue of this New Edition. The idea that we should undertake to plagiarize a standard work, published at our Book Room, preposterously imputes to us an attempt to steal a man's property not only before his own eyes in open day, but also before the eyes of the public. Next to the stupidity of committing such an act is the stupidity of imputing it.

perhaps been saved from some mistakes, even if he had lost some of both his toil and his consciousness of origination. At least he would have escaped the sad mistake of claiming that any point in our theology was his own invention, and charging any one who had occasion to state that point with "stealing my thunder." Wesleyan-Arminian theology does claim that there may be a necessary innocence, rectitude, and holiness, as well as a necessary wickedness and depravity. The holiness received by Adam from his Creator was necessarily received. The depravity of the born infant is to him a necessary depravity. It requires a "gracious ability," derived from a system of supernatural grace, to enable man to emerge from its necessitating power. The formula of this Theodicy, though indicating the true key-principle, does not accurately express it in accordance with Wesleyan Arminianism. What the true formula is we have stated and illustrated on pages 375–396 of our volume on The Will. The true statement is, that there can be no necessitated guilt, or desert, and so no just reward or penalty, or proper divine government. That the true formula is correctly stated four or five times in fifty in the Theodicy does not mend the matter. To state it once falsely—as it is stated an immense number of times—is to state a falsity. To state both ways, and rightly by accident, simply demonstrates an unconsciousness of the exact nature of the formula required. With this due correction, the power of the argument, and the ability with which it is persistently put through by Dr. Bledsoe, remain the same. The whole is well worthy the attentive study and complete acquirement of the young theologian.

The able author also advances the doctrine that freedom to evil is necessary to freedom to the good, (p. 195.) Now Methodist theology holds that a man may be free to an immense variety of alternatives within the field of good alone. Without the ability derived through the atonement, man is free also to boundless varieties of volition within the domain of evil alone. Dr. Bledsoe's view plainly contradicts our Eighth Article of Faith, which declares that by the Fall man is free to evil only. Dr. Fisk in his very able "Calvinistic Controversy" uses the proposition that man may be free to one alone of the two as a key-principle to refute a whole series of fallacies in New England Calvinism. The true proposition—and it is one which Dr. B. would doubtless indorse—is, that power both ways, to good and to evil, is necessary (unless willfully forfeited) to responsibility, guilt, merit, reward, or punishment, and, so, is the condition of a just moral government. The

very fact that such a power is recognized by our theology as requisite to the existence of guilt as lying at the basis of a just divine government, is the very fact that requires our doctrine of a "gracious ability." The doctrine that there can be guilt in an agent who was never capable of right, is a contradiction not only to our theology, but to human intuition. The man who asserts it ought to be ready to affirm that there can be a square without a right-angle in it.

The same key-principle is used, with great skill and power, in unlocking the problem of the eternity of human punishment. The damned are those who cannot be made holy without necessitating their holiness; and that is a contradiction, and so not within the range even of Omnipotence. Our author did not originate the principle, nor its application. Archbishop King suggests the ground that the damned prefer their hell to heaven.* Swedenborg has elaborated the same principle into a splendid envisioned system† Yet nowhere is the principle wrought out in logic, and within the limits of orthodoxy, so clearly, through its many ramifications, as in this volume. So far as we can recollect, this view is unmentioned, and, apparently, unknown, in our earlier Methodist theology. The eternity, both of the bliss and the woe, of future retribution, is founded, in our standards, not on a volitional certainty, but upon an absolute impossibility of change. Yet for long years we have known the eternity of punishment based, in our pulpits, on the eternity of willful sinning. We suspect, too, that this part of this Theodicy has made a serious impression, extensively, upon the mind of our deep thinkers. Will there not, however, arise therefrom a tendency to the adoption of Stier's view of the limitation of eternal misery to those who have sinned against the Holy Ghost?

The Appendix, now first added to the present volume, is so ballanced by excellences and drawbacks that we doubt whether the writer's best friends would have very peremptorily advised its insertion. Especially does the contrast in courtesy and dignity

* See his "Origin of Evil," p. 309, in which he suggests that "The Damned choose their miserable State, as Lovers, angry, ambitious, envious Persons indulge themselves in those things which increase their Misery." The drunkard strikes us as the best instance.

† Wilkinson, in his Life of Swedenborg, claims that Swedenborg's solution of Hell is a triumph over all previous conceptions, whether of Homer, Virgil, Dante, or Milton. The damned are inspired with an inverted ambition downward. They aspire deeper and deeper down the bottomless abyss, shooting eternally, with an ever increasing intensity, downward, until the skies are forgotten.

between the Theodicy and the Appendix suggest that the writer's mind has been embittered in the sad interval of years between the two writings. An objurgatory sub-tone underlying the whole, and sometimes "erupting" volcanically above the surface, tires the reader, and he begins to feel as if he were listening to a testy man. The writer of a sophistical article against his Theodicy in the "Southern Presbyterian Review," Dr. Bocock, is bountifully scolded, and the following is a specimen of the exclamatory style: "Yet has our most infallible and omnipotent critic set forth the whole of this vindication in one short sentence! Great man! Wonderful genius! Surely he could easily put the ocean in an egg-shell, or construct a palace with a single pebble! Let us see, then, how the poor 'Theodicy' is made to hide its diminished head in a single sentence." Dr. B. seems to aim at a clean field in Arminian Theodicy by annihilating both foes and friends: foes, because he can endure no contradiction from gainsayers; and friends, because he can "bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne." But it is our unchangeable opinion that the challenge contained in the following two sentences cannot be safely accepted: "It is certainly easy to misrepresent and ridicule my 'Theodicy,' if we may judge from the habit of its Calvinistic adversaries. But who, or where, is the adversary by whom its foundations have been shaken?"

Humanity Immortal; or, Man Tried, Fallen, and Redeemed. By LAURENS P. HICKOK, D.D., LL.D. 8vo., pp. 362. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Dr. Hickok, in his "Creator and Creation," to which the present volume furnishes a proper complement, announced the purpose, here executed, of tracing the history of man from his beginning, through his trial, fall, redemption, and resurrection, to his eternal state. The guides in the investigation are the speculative reason, Holy Scripture, and the records of past ages, so far as they bear upon the case. The author assumes at the outset the theory of Life propounded in the former work. It lies at the basis of the whole discussion. To the conscious sentient life of the animal kingdom reason is supernaturally added in man, constituting a new and spiritual kingdom. The former lasts only so long as the nervous organism holds together, while in man the rational spirit secures immortality and perpetual intelligence, with a capacity for moral character, and it furthermore immortalizes its own sentient soul and all the essential forces in human individuality. Nature knows nothing higher than the gratification of sense; but the

crown of reason gives man control of nature, and points to the subordination of all sense-appetite to spiritual integrity as the condition of virtue.

Soon or late the character for virtue must be tested, and that from the necessity of the case, and not from the arbitrary will of the Creator. To this primitive trial of humanity the first chapter is devoted. The two opposite principles of sense and spirit existing in the constitution are certain to come into conflict, and that will be the hour for self-conquest or shame. There is greater danger to man in allowing the occasion of the first trial to fortuitously present itself, than there is if God shall himself arrange it. The principles necessarily directing in the trial Dr. Hickok sums up as follows: "(1.) Integrity of character is in the control of sense by the spirit. (2.) The trial must be imposed at the very outset. (3.) The test must put the sense and spirit squarely in conflict. (4.) The destruction in subjecting the spirit to the flesh should be plainly announced. (5.) The capabilities for an eternal state of bliss can be attained only in passing the hazard of such a trial." The Mosaic account shows these principles to have been applied to the case in hand. The result we know. Man fixed his own disposition in the end of self-gratification instead of the supremacy of the reason. Conscience became subordinate to appetite, spirit to sense, the *πνεῦμα* to the *ψυχή*. His sin was wholly of his own origination, and from it there is no self-recovery. The enslaved spirit has not power to burst its bonds. Man's disposition toward God was changed, as was God's toward him.

The second chapter describes humanity awaiting redemption. The tri-personality of the Godhead, or, as Dr. Hickok puts it, the "threefold conscious voluntariness in absolute reason," visible in creation and in governmental administration, is equally manifest in the work of redemption. The Logos, who will become incarnate when the fallen and deeply degraded race is prepared to receive and choose the only possible method of recovery, undertakes the task of its discipline and instruction. The history shows the wickedness of man to have been great, but the necessity of forty centuries of such an education as he gave the world exhibits, as nothing else can, the fearful depth of the fall. The flood, the ordination of capital punishment in protection against violence, the confusion of tongues at Babel, and the wonderful shortening of human life, were but successive special disciplinary providences for the curbing of depraved propensities. Then,

when the world's religion was becoming one of sensuality, it was found expedient to select one man whose posterity should be carefully trained to become a missionary nation to the race. And even then it was finally necessary to eliminate from the plan ten of the twelve Hebrew tribes, and with the other two pursue the work of preparation. The biblical account supplies the main facts for the hundred and thirty pages devoted to this portion of the history, but in the skillful hand of our author they are set forth with striking power. A fourfold result was attained: one nation was cured of pagan tendencies and brought to worship Jehovah alone; the idolatrous nations were made to recognize him as greater and more powerful than their own gods; the world was brought to expect the coming of One who would bring deliverance to sorrowing men; and many hearts were prepared to receive him and the spiritual truths which he might proclaim.

The presentation of the incarnation, work, and doctrine of the Redeemer is for the most part after the orthodox pattern, and vigorous and fresh, withal. The weightiest problems are firmly grasped. Now and then, indeed, the exposition trips, as when, for instance, we read, "So incarnated, Deity can be tempted," and "The devil promptly seized this first offered occasion for tempting Deity." It is bad enough to interpose the Godhead of Jesus as an impenetrable shield for his manhood against the force of temptation, but it is inconceivable that the Godhead should itself be the subject of attack.

Full redemption for all having been provided by the Logos according to the eternal ideas in the Father, it remained for the Holy Spirit to apply it in the conviction, conversion, and sanctification of men. The sections discussing the manner of his agency and the work which he accomplishes draw upon the strongest powers of the author, but he is not able to avoid the fearful collapse which befalls every attempt to combine "effectual calling" with universal redemption and human freedom. No amount of repetition and emphasis can obliterate the contradiction. Nor does the Spirit fulfill his office of applying the redemption, if he fails to give sufficient help for repentance to all for whom Christ died. A turning freely that is also a "secured" turning is but the turning of a machine. "Why not turn more? Why not save all?" become thus truly groveling questions. This, however, is the fault of the system, and not of Dr. Hickok. But we have not this apology for his adducing Paul's doctrine "that all, Jews and Gentiles, are under sin," and Solomon's well-worn

statement that "There is not a just man on earth that doeth good and sinneth not," to prove the completion of sanctification only at death; and still less for his Scripture argument for unconditional perseverance. We pass by several passages, torn and perverted from their logical connection, to the unscholarly reading of Heb. vi, 4–6: "It is impossible... if they shall fall away." Dr. Hickok is, or *ought* to be, sufficiently familiar with his Greek Testament to know that what our version so strangely interprets is aorist and not future, declarative and not conditional, and can only be translated, *and have fallen away.* Yet upon the false reading he builds a whole paragraph of argument, which, with the loss of its foundation, falls helpless to the ground. Instead of the "strongest expression of improbability," the passage is a statement of actual occurrence, doubtless within the knowledge of his readers, of Hebrew Christians who had abandoned Christ, and joined with Jews in denouncing him as an impostor.

The fifth and final chapter of the work, on last things in redemption, presents many thoughtful views, which we can only outline. In death the animal body drops off and dissolves, leaving the spirit and soul immortal but separated. The soul has its soul-body made up of "the substantial material forces that were the basis of the animal body," and the spirit has also its body, consisting of ethereal forces. Complete individuality is interrupted in death; the spirit, with the spirit-body, goes out in freedom into the ethereal universe, restricted only by its own moral disposition; while the sentient soul, with its soul-body, remains behind, unconscious but indestructible. In the resurrection the rational spirit finds its own sentient soul, the spiritual body unites with the psychical body by virtue of the energy of the spirit, thoroughly eliminating whatever may remain of the material that belongs only to the earthly life, thus making "the identical and individual personality which dwelt on the earth." The final judgment and the entrance upon the retributions of eternity finish the history proper, but the author takes us on to the end of the Mediatorial reign, when the Son will surrender the kingdom to the Father. Then, he thinks, the ends of the incarnation having been accomplished, the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ will be severed, and his humanity become, like all others, subject to God. The pages elaborating these views will richly compensate the reader, even though they may fail to carry conviction.

D. A. W.

Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects. By HENRY EDWARD. American edition. Volume I. 12mo., pp. 438. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1872.

Sermons on Living Subjects. By HORACE BUSHNELL. 12mo., pp. 468. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

The sermons of Archbishop Manning, first-named above, are one of the many specimens of pulpit eloquence with which the Roman Church continues to adorn herself. The argumentative aim of each sermon, however clothed with fervid imagination, and expressed in semi-poetic diction, is never lost from view. One sermon paints the age of Thomas à Becket, when all power had floated to the hierarchy, in hues of rainbow radiance. Another sermon on "The Negro Mission," to our Southern blacks, makes humble confession of England's sin for sending slavery hither, but forgets all contrition for the sin of Romanism in doing its best to perpetuate slavery in America. The past political history of American Catholicism is a poor certificate for her to the American negro.

The sermons of the great pulpit thinker of Minnesota are in a different style. A series of sententious titles are but indexes of the deep wisdom unfolded in the productions they indicate. The brain of the great Congregationalist grows mightier with advancing years.

Discourses upon the Attributes of God. By STEPHEN CHARNOCK, B.D., Fellow of New College, Oxford. With his Life and Character. By WILLIAM SYMINGTON, D.D. Two volumes in one. 8vo., pp. 543. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

Sermons and Discourses. By THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. Now Completed by the Introduction of his Posthumous Sermons. Two volumes in one. 8vo., pp. 473. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

Charnock belongs to that class of old Puritan divines whose place is fixed, we suppose, beyond criticism. To us their works are magnificent structures of religious common-place. Subjectively, we catch not the slightest spark of inspiration from them, unless it be a powerful predisposition to somnolency. But, doubtless, there are others to whom they are a power, and to that cast of minds we abandon them.

Chalmers is a man whose reputation did not surpass his real greatness. His sermons were full of life and inspiring power. We hold him, as philosopher, theologian, and preacher, in intellect and grandeur of imagination the greatest mind the Scottish pulpit ever produced. Our objection to this edition is that its inferior material and avoirdupois solidity give to the book a look of crude heaviness that belonged not to the man, and belong not to the splendid thought overspreading the dull-looking pages.

The Foot-Prints of Satan; or, The Devil in History, (the Counterpart of God in History.) By Rev. Hollis Read, A.M. 12mo., pp. 557. New York: E. B. Treat. 1872.

In a unique and trenchant form Mr. Read has arranged and arraigned the forces of Evil that now make war on the happiness of the world and the kingdom of Christ on earth. The various forms which Satanism puts on are analyzed and portrayed. The devil is detected in war, in intemperance, in the perversion of intellect, wealth, the press; and in false religions, of which Romanism is the specimen instance. Then comes the devil in man, arousing his lusts, desecrating the marriage relations, and spreading licentiousness, demoralization, disease, and death. The remedy for all is Christ's second coming, destroying the destroyer and ruling the world in person. Meanwhile the more immediate remedy, we think, is the waging moral battle with the weapons of truth and Christianity. Mr. Read's book may be recommended to the warriors in this battle as an armory of weapons.

From Atheism to Christianity. By Rev. George P. Porter. 16mo., pp. 121. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Having made the transition, Mr. Porter proposes to show the route for others. He does this in a series of progressive chapters full of sententious suggestions. So paragraphic is he, so impatient of over-fullness, that the reader might scarce be able to make the series of leaps of inference did not the table of contents furnish a clear clue to the line of thought. Thinkers will analyze his ingots with pleasure. He shows that God, the living God, is the demand of the heart and soul of man. Given humanity as it is, and the God of our Bible is a necessity.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Allgemeine Pädagogik, (General Pedagogics.) von Dr. E. Böhl. Wien: W. Braumüller. 1872.

Public schools are based on the assumption that pupils are numerical units of like capacities and wants. The assumption is only partially true. Pupils differ in many directions, and hence require different qualities in instruction and in instructors. But public schools are obviously indispensable. The question then arises, How can they be made most nearly to meet their end? How can their inevitable defectiveness be best complemented? The book before us is a conscientious endeavor to answer this question, and contains theoretical and practical views interesting

to teachers in all lands. The general positions of the author are these: Educative influencing should be an organic whole. All education that does not bear upon the whole destination of the pupil is dangerous. The end of education is not, as Rousseau taught, to make men out of Christians, but to make Christians out of men. Teachers can accomplish their work only in so far as they are genuine Christians. They must be of some positive religion, and all schools should be of some confessional type. No other profession requires such a thorough preparation. The fewer the pupils the greater the success of the teacher. He should be able to enter into sympathy with the peculiar wants—health, capacity, temperament—of each pupil. He should either be himself the parent, or at least stand in intimate relations to the parent. Children-schools are a modern pestilence. Until eleven or twelve years the child's vitality should go chiefly to building up its body. Until after this age the school should not seriously invade the family-life. The father is the sun and the mother the moon, and around these chief luminaries of the domestic firmament the children and servants should revolve as planets, each obedient in its proper orbit. But this divinely-ordered state of things is getting sadly interrupted. The school has largely arrogated to itself the functions of the family. Not only so, but it is slaughtering the innocents by thousands. On an average, one third of the volunteers for the Prussian army have to be rejected as physically incapable. The exhausting iron-rule of the school-system is the cause. There is need here of reform. Ideal education is where the teacher is a perfect Christian, and where his influence comes in only as a complement to that of the parent.

The pedagogics of Dr. Böhl would not injure American pedagogues. Are not also our public schools verging on a pernicious system of secularism and high pressure?

Weltelend und Weltschmerz, (World-woe and World-wail,) *eine Rede.* von JURGEN BONA MEYER. Bonn: Adolph Marcus. 1872.*

Professor Meyer, formerly of Berlin, now of Bonn, is one of the most genial and wide-awake philosophical *dilettanti* of the day. He has recently published a volume of twelve lectures, in which he discusses, in clear popular style, and from a healthy moral stand-point, the most knotty "Philosophical Questions of the Day." The essay on *Weltelend und Weltschmerz* is an able refutation of the chief sophisms of the *pessimism* of Schopenhauer

* This department of foreign Book Notices is mostly furnished by Prof. Lacroix.

and Hartmann. The position of Schopenhauer was: All existence rests upon a willing to exist; now, willing is desiring, and desiring presupposes a want; but every want conditions a suffering; hence suffering is involved in all willing Only suffering, unpleasure, is positive; all joy, pleasure, is negative, is simply the absence of misery. Man is the neediest of all sentient creatures. As his walking is but a constantly arrested falling, so is his life a constantly arrested dying, and so is all mental pleasure simply an incessantly repressed *ennui.* Human life is a business that does not cover the costs. The true wisdom lies in the *nirvana* of Indian Buddhism. With Schopenhauer essentially agrees Eduard Von Hartmann, in his "Philosophy of the Unconscious," save only that he does not contest the reality of some positive pleasure in life. Hartmann's method is empirical. He examines and sums up, on the one hand, all the various joys of life, and, on the other, all the ills to which flesh is heir; and then, balancing the one sum against the other, finds that the joy-quantum kicks the beam. He concludes that life in general is so sad that no reasonable man would choose to recommence and live his life over again, and that it is only the deceptive hope of a better life that makes us prefer life to death, existence to nonentity. Professor Meyer not only shows, step by step, the fallacies of these pessimists, but attempts to account for the fact that so large a circle of political and literary journals have recently overabounded in laudation of the views of Hartmann. Schopenhauer's thoughts began to take root only in the years 1840–50, when the miseries of the German people were at their acme. The chagrin following in the train of 1848 drove them into still deeper hopelessness, and thus made them receptive for a philosophy of despair. Hartmann met the want, hence his popularity. Mr. Meyer thinks that, now that Germany has risen from her political paralysis, the public will lose its relish for pessimism, and turn its regards to the sunnier fields of a sane philosophy.

Die Entstehung der menschlichen Sprache, etc. (The Origin of Human Speech, etc.) von Dr. WEBER. Heidelberg. 1871.

Professor Weber, of Freiburg, desired two years ago to signalize the fiftieth anniversary of his philosophical doctorate by the publication of a mature work on the harmony of physics, anthropology, and philosophy. Hindered by failing health from his full design, he is endeavoring to carry it out on some of the chief subordinate topics. The essay above named discusses man's place in nature and history, and the origin and development of human

speech. It is pervaded by sound views, and forms quite a contrast to the turn of thought now in vogue among a large class of scientists. Some of Professor Weber's positions are these: Mankind forms a separate natural kingdom; as separate as the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms. To overlook this involves the naturalist in absurd consequences. Man, shut out from society, learns no language-proper; he rises, like the animal, only to mimic sounds and signs to express his sensations. Man becomes man only among men. Man is never an animal; were he so he would never become man. Metamorphoses of a limited character take place within each kingdom. Varieties arise within families. Genera, species, families may perish in telluric catastrophes, but are never changed into others. As little as a mineral can be changed into a plant, or a plant into an animal, so little can an animal become a man. It is astonishing that talented and versatile men, like Karl Vogt, can assume that man descends from the ape. It is only from a lack of philosophical training that such absurd views are to be accounted for. Essays such as this of Dr. Weber cannot fail of a happy influence.

Christliche Glaubenslehre vom Methodistischen Standpunkt. (Methodist Dogmatics.) von A. SULZBERGER, Dr. phil. Bremen: Tractathaus, Georgstrasse, 59.

That vigorous young offshoot of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Conference in Germany, is beginning to add intellectual to its spiritual fruitfulness. One of its sons gives us here the first installment of a system of Methodist Dogmatics. In Mr. Sulzberger's case the *Dr. phil.* is not an empty suffix. He came to it honestly, through sturdy work under great University lights. The work he has undertaken is greatly needed by our Church in Germany. As Dr. Sulzberger is a thorough Methodist in heart, and well versed in the requisite English as well as German sources, we have reason to hope that he will meet the demands of the case. He lays his work out on an ample scale, and begins it, in true German style, by laying the foundations broad and deep, and by abundantly fortifying them with the authority of precedent and great names. This "*heft*" of 189 pages contains only the Introduction (150 pages) and the Doctrine of God (39 pages). The Introduction gives evidence of thorough study, and contains (*a*) A characterization of dogmatics; (*b*) A discussion of the Scriptures as authority and norm; (*c*) A history of dogmatics; and, (*d*) The method of dogmatics. From a careful look into the work we are led earnestly to hope that the gifted young author may speedily bring it to completion.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Introduction to the Study of Biology. By H. ALLEYNE NICHOLSON, Professor of Natural History and Botany in University College, Toronto. 12mo., pp. 163. New York: Appleton & Co. 1872.

This little manual has received, as it deserves, high commendation from the English reviews. To those who desire a brief and clear introduction to the Science of Life and living nature, as it stands at the present hour, as free as possible from technicalities, and without the polemical spirit vitiating its discussions, can find no better horn-book. A series of momentous questions, to which the attention of the thoughtful public is intensely directed at the present time, is discussed with perfect calmness and great clearness. The Nature of *Life*, Protoplasm, the "Vital Force," are the topics of the first chapter. The Nature of Species, Elemental Cells, the wonderful phenomena of Reproduction, Spontaneous Generation, Origin of Species, Evolution, Creation, and Darwinism, form the topics of twelve chapters. The two closing chapters discuss the distribution of animals in space as embraced in Physical Geography, and their distribution in time as revealed in the strata of Geology.

On the topic of Protoplasm, or more properly, as Dr. Beale calls it, Bioplasm, he admits the true existence of a "physical basis of life," but exposes Huxley's stupid blunder in confounding the basis with the life itself. The basis is only a condition of the manifestation of life, as the conductor is the basis of the manifestation of electricity. But in neither case is the basis necessary to the existence of the element. Lightning exists without the conductor, and the life may exist without the bioplasm. And the phenomena of life cannot be *chemically* explained. There is an immense amount of cases in which the vital phenomena operate by overriding all known chemical forces and laws. These anti-chemical and super-chemical forces must provisionally, at least, be labeled as "vital forces." It is true, science has in past times been much advanced by rescuing to the domain of chemistry much that was once included in the domain of "vital force."

Our physiological brethren are greatly puzzled to find a definition of *Life*. Even Mr. Nicholson, after giving some specimens of definition furnished by some great scientists, which are hardly creditable to them as men of sense, to say nothing of science, fairly gives it up. To us it seems odd that they never look to the world of *mind*, nor ever recognize such a thing as intelligence, in their pursuit after a definition. As a psychologist, at any rate, we

have, or imagine we have, no difficulty—so far, at least, as psychology is concerned. Life we define as that state of organic matter which is necessary to its becoming the basis of intelligence. Or, more briefly, Life is the organic condition of thought. This, indeed, defines animal life alone; and rightly, for animal life is a different *thing* from vegetable life, and so the same description ought not to suit both. Vegetable *life*, if *life* it is to be called, is the organic condition of *the true growth process*. The animal shares the same *organic* life as the vegetable, with a higher thought-conditioning life; so that both animals and vegetables *grow*, and nothing else *does grow*. Neither a rolling snow-ball nor a crystal *grows*, but animals and plants alone do grow. Vegetable life, therefore, is *the organic condition of growth*, while animal life is *the organic condition of thought*.

How does a microscopist decide that a scarce visible animalcular particle is alive? In no other way than by its movements resembling those produced by volitions in larger animals. So that manifested volition after all is with him the *test* of life. But even the first faint gleam of sensation in a material particle would imply *life*. And this enables a psychologist, at any rate, to draw *in thought* the real distinction between animals and plants, which in their lowest orders become undistinguishable to the eye of the physiologist. The animal belongs, however dimly enlightened, to the intelligent world. And between intelligence and absolute unintelligence the difference is infinite. The faintest possible spark of sensation in the lowest animal being is *in nature* one with the highest intelligence, and belongs to the universe of mind overlying the universe of matter.

The Primeval Man: An Examination of some Recent Speculations. By the Duke of Argyll. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Dewitt C. Lent & Co. 1872.

A handsome edition, essentially unaltered, of the Duke's book. It is in Three Parts. Part First contains some very conclusive arguments against Darwinism; Part Second concedes the reality of the geologic man, but, by sacrificing the Scripture chronology, still maintains the descent of the race from Adam, who existed untold ages ago; Part Third endeavors to show that primeval man, though unversed in science, possessed that clear balance of faculties which exempts him from being properly called a barbarian.

In the First Part the Duke, taking Huxley's concession that man's mental superiority to the brute is "practically infinite," unan-

swerably replies that, then, as by the materialist's own concession mind is the result of cerebral structure or substance, it follows that there must be a practically infinite superiority in man's brain over the highest brute brain. This at once silences all the talk about there being less difference in brain between lowest man and highest brute than between highest man and lowest man. The Duke justly condemns the claims of the present zoological classifications into species to present any true view of the nearness or distance to the brute of man's *being*, as a whole. The classifications are based on points which, though running through and comprehending large numbers of individuals, are really subordinate points. The point by which man is classified with bimanuals is an incident in man's nature; and even in that incident, namely, of the *hand*, man's superiority is measureless; but the main quality of man, his *mind*, is entirely shut out of view. Science may, of course, have her *way* and her *say;* but, then, her *say* says nothing whatever as to the entire man's real relations to brute. We do not go to Zoology to learn the true nature of man; for the *zoon* is the lowest part of man.

Argyll is very conclusive against Darwin on the geological argument. When Darwin is told that the pages of Geology furnish no minutely gradual advances of animal forms, he replies that we have but fragmentary scraps of the full geologic record, which truly extends through millions of millions of years. Had we the whole book, then you would see one pictured series of infinitesimal advances. To this Professor Thomson replies that Natural Philosophy refuses to allow more than one hundred millions of years. Argyll additionally replies that there are some strata of large extent in which there clearly is no break, and in which new races are seen to spring, with sudden completeness and in large numbers, into existence. These facts seem to exclude Darwinism from all *status*, even as a scientific *hypothesis*. The earliest human skull that geology has dug up belonged to a well-developed man. Nothing seems left us save the Old Bible doctrine of immediate creation.

After so victorious a battle with Darwinism we much regret that the Duke, in the Second Part, makes so easy a concession of the reality of the geologic man.

Should, however, the geologic man be demonstrated we could not accept the Duke's theory in behalf of Moses. We again say that we should by far prefer the views of Poole and M'Causland, of the derivation of man from different centers of creation. We

should then hold that there is a unity of the race, not in parentage, but in nature—in prolificacy and in Christ. Our reason is that the Duke's theory breaks the Scripture text and destroys the Messianic genealogy, while Poole's only revolutionizes our exegesis of a number of Scripture texts, yet without distributing the foundations of our evangelical theology. But the Duke's book is a model of pure and graceful English diction, and is well worth the perusal of every thinker interested in the subject.

The Science of Æsthetics; or, The Nature, Kinds, Laws, and Uses of Beauty. By HENRY N. DAY, Author of "Logic," "Art of Discourse," "English Literature," etc. 12mo., pp. 434. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield & Co. 1872.

Professor Day (of Yale College) has very skillfully shaped the treatment of Æsthetics into a systematic manual convenient for the ordinary student and reader, and admirably adapted for the purposes of recitation in our academies and colleges. If our crowded courses of study will admit a new insertion, this branch of scholarly accomplishment presents a very desirable addition. A due training of the mind in the principles of beauty improves the character and opens to the view new and boundless sources of a pleasure almost too high and pure to be called a "pleasure." There is also a wonderful occult relation between æsthetic and ethic. Cultivate the mind's eye with æsthetic truth, and traces of the divine are discerned in the system of creation, naturally rendering atheism repugnant to the feelings. And the elevating effects of the study are adverse to low materialism. The solution of the problem of the beautiful as presented by Professor Day enables us to feel that alike the world around us and the world within us, the macrocosm and the microcosm, are *spirit in matter*, and that there is a genuine sympathy and oneness between the divine in both worlds.

The work is symmetrically and exhaustively divided into Four Parts. The first ascertains the Nature of Beauty; that is, from a brief history of the various theories touching the true source of the beautiful in things, it decides and demonstrates the final and true view of beauty itself. The second classifies the Kinds of Beauty; that is, it traces in things the different sorts into which they may as beautiful be divided. Thence, third, a synthesis is given of the Laws of Beauty; for, after having learned what Beauty is, and what sorts and forms of it there are, we may proceed to ascertain under what principles we may decide upon what is beautiful, and how we can ourselves, discarding all the

ugly and spuriously beautiful, construct truly beautiful things. Thus we have drawn out the beauty that exists so as to enjoy it, and we have even learned ourselves how to create it. The fourth part treats the Relations of Beauty to other departments of thought, and the Uses of Beauty in its purifying, moralizing, and ennobling effects upon the character. It is rather an addendum to the system, which is complete in the previous three parts, but it possesses great practical value.

Certainly our public and private character as a people cannot be harmed by a leisurely and fuller study of the orderly and the becoming. Our great Republic excels in fierce energy, very liable to wreck were it not that our wonderful historic training in civil organization had so long preserved us. But what dangers surround us and lie in our future path! Next to Christianity and organizing law, quite valuable to us is a tranquilizing study, by a much enlarging class of minds, of the principles that form the basis of harmony and order. An ennobled, refined, and religious character is the sure basis of our future well-being. Natural science in the hands of scoffing materialists is dragging us downward; it is well that there is a higher science or two to draw us upward.

The Works of Rev. Robert Murray M'Cheyne. Complete in one volume. 12mo., pp. 518. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

M'Cheyne, born in 1813 and dying in 1843, was a marvel of youthful talent, holiness, and intense devotion to the work of saving souls and extending the reign of truth and righteousness. He is well styled by the "Nashville Christian Advocate" the "Summerfield of Scotland." But, unlike Summerfield, he has left in his works, forming the large body of this volume, a monument of his genius well worthy the study of the ministry and the Church.

History, Biography, and Topography.

History of the Missions of the Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches. By RUFUS ANDERSON,, D.D.,LL.D. In two volumes. 12mo., pp. 426, 532. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. 1872.

Dr. Anderson's handsome volumes relate to us the history of the the American Missions to the cradle of Christianity and the cradle of the human race. It is a history of profound interest to every lover of missions and to every student of human progress. It extends from the year 1819, when those two pioneers of blessed memory, Pliny Fisk and Levi Par-

sons, first started on their tour of exploration. And we may say that the American Board seems ever to have been happy in the *personnel* of its missions. The holy men and women who consecrated themselves to this service were eminently faithful in their lives, and their deaths were often luminous with tokens of the divine presence. There seems to have been a timely providence in the awakening of the enterprise of missions for these regions simultaneously with those great changes by which modern civilization has been rolling its waves of light eastward. It was a matter of immense importance that the pure beams of the Gospel should blend with those influences. Paganism, Mohammedanism, and dead Christianity were ruling in the East, and wisely did the thoughtful planners of these missions understand that in order to the victory over the former two dead Christianity must first be brought to life. These blessed missionaries are to be claimed as the common property of the evangelic Church. Though given to this work by a denomination, they did not go to make Congregationalists or Presbyterians, but to vitalize, if possible, the ritualisms and hierarchisms they were to find with the power of godliness. Herein they were good Methodists; seeking to perform the very work which Wesley enterprised in his day, the quickening Churchianity into Christianity. And, like Wesley, they never withdrew from the hierarchy and organized a new system until it was clear that hierarchy knew not the day of its visitation. The toils and expenditures of the supporters of this great enterprise have not been in vain. They have planted many a luminous center amid the surrounding twilight, brightening the twilight into daylight. They have broken down the barriers of Mohammedan intolerance, and made the Oriental conscience free to inquire and to accept the Gospel. They have established the usual routine of a higher order of life—the pulpits, the schools, the periodicals, the libraries and the presses by which the atmosphere of that ancient land is made rife with evangelical influences. Our prayer and our trust may well be that in another half century the birthplace of our Christianity will be awakened to a new birth and life. We thank Dr. Anderson for these noble volumes.

A Western Pioneer; or, Incidents of the Life and Times of Rev. Alfred Brunson, A.M., D.D., Embracing a Period of over Seventy Years. Written by Himself. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 418. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1872.

If the proportions of the present volume be carried out Dr. Brunson's portraiture will be as nearly "large as life" as that of

any personage in our Methodist history since Wesley. Some will object to its fullness of unimportant and ordinary details; but he assures us that he "has studied brevity notwithstanding its length;" had "*every* incident. . . . been recorded, the work would have been greatly extended;" and that "no two incidents precisely alike are recorded."

As a summary of his services he says: "I have preached nearly, or quite, *ten thousand* times—I cannot say sermons, for many of them were often repeated, and improved by the repetition—and have been instrumental, under God, of saving at least *six thousand* souls; and though, mostly, my work has been on new and poor ground, I have aided, directly or indirectly, in building about *forty churches*."

As a picture of past times in the progress of Methodism and of our country, as furnishing testimony in regard to some important characters and events, and as a record of the services of any able and faithful "pioneer" in our aggressive movements, the volume will doubtless be welcome to a large body of readers.

History of Methodism: Its Establishment and Extension into the Different Parts of the Earth. After the most Authentic Sources. By L. S. JACOBY. Volume I, *British Methodism.* Volume II, *American Methodism.* 12mo., paper covers, pp. 350, 476. Bremen: Office of the Tract House. 1870.*

Untoward circumstances have delayed first our receiving, and then our noticing, Dr. Jacoby's volumes in good time. We have read them with interest both as an excellent presentation of their subjects and a marked symbol of progress. They are written to present to German readers the proof that Methodism is a movement in which the divine Spirit was the moving power. Not human talent, nor a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, nor efficient machinery, nor even true doctrines, sufficed to solve the problem, though these were all present; but the Divine Presence in the wheels secured their revolving progress. His story is told with the clearness, plainness, and strong earnestness with which the German mind often grapples our "Christianity in earnest."

The first volume, after an introductory review of the anterior religious history and condition of England, traces the rise and progress of original Methodism through its different epochs. Six chapters carry us to the death of the Wesleys, and two chapters more to the death of Bunting. One chapter narrates the Irish,

* *Geschichte des Methodismus*, seiner Enstehung und Ausbreitung in den verscheidenen Theilen der Erde. Nach authentischen Quellen bearbeitet. von L. S. Jacoby. Erster Theil, pp. 350. Tsweiter Theil, pp. 476. Bremen: Verlag des Tractathauses. 1870.

French, and Canadian Methodist history; and the three remaining chapters review the missionary organization, the ecclesiastical polity, and the literature of English Methodism.

The second volume presents the history of American Methodism, down to 1868, in eight chapters. Two chapters then review our literature and our missions. The eleventh chapter, forming, very properly, full one third of the volume, narrates the history of German Methodism, from its first dawn in the conversion of William Nast, through its spread in America and Fatherland, down to the date of publication. The founding and growth of our Theological Seminary under, successively, Professor Warren and Professor Hurst, are duly traced. The two final chapters describe our ecclesiastical organization, and furnish a summary of the doctrines of Methodism. This summary is given with great clearness and simplicity, mostly, indeed, in the translated words of Wesley himself. In the German part of our work Dr. Jacoby has been so leading a sharer that he was eminently fitted to be its historian. These volumes are admirably suited for circulation among German readers on both sides of the Atlantic; and Anglo-Americans readers of German may find a peculiar zest in seeing the story of Methodism told in the deep Teutonic brogue.

California for Health, Pleasure, and Residence. By CHARLES NORDHOFF, Author of "Cape Cod and All Along Shore," etc. 8vo., pp. 255. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

If you are going to visit California you will read Mr. Nordhoff's book as counselor and guide. If you cannot make a visit you can read the book as a substitute. Perhaps you may know more of California by the book without the visit than by the visit without the book. At any rate the author is a very natural well-aired traveler, who is sure to see what ought to be seen, and know what ought to be known, with a facile and hearty way of telling the whole, free from the effort to be ceaselessly brilliant. Whatever is picturesque for the sentimentalist, or paying for the emigrant, or hygienic for the invalid, is here unfolded in narrative, and, where possible, made visible in engraving. It is a grand surprise that the Almighty has wrought for us, that the richest and sweetest part of our continental heritage has but just opened before us. It opens as a rich reward for that free and glorious energy which has founded our republican system, preserved at the price of rivers of blood our nationality, and consummated our interoceanic railroad, prepared and bestowed by Infinite Goodness. It is, however, in our permanent character as a consistent and constitutional semi-

invalid, seldom sick and never well, that we have read this book with most interest. We were, for a while, enabled to live in rich imagination in the American Italy, superior to Italy herself, of Southern California, so refreshingly, that when we had finished, the irritation of our bronchials was so sensibly diminished that we concluded not to go.

A Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land in 1869–70. By HENRY M. HARMON, D.D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 12mo., pp. 332. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

Professor Harmon has taken the usual tour booked up by countless predecessors, and he states, himself, the question, "Why publish?" He indicates some originalities on some special points contained in his book. But the true reason is that every leading man has a circle, or a number of concentric circles, who from acquaintance and sympathy will see more freshly through his eyes, and may well be induced to look and learn what is new to them, though old to the rest of the reading world. The Professor is not, like some of his predecessors, sensationally witty, or picturesque, or sentimental. We do not remember a sentence that tries to be eloquent or poetical. *Things as they are*, with clear, strong prosaic perception, are presented, so that those who make his eyes their spy-glasses will be apt to see them as they are too.

Dr. J. J. I. von Döllinger's Fables respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages. Translated by ALFRED PLUMER, together with Dr. Döllinger's Essay on the Prophetic Spirit and the Prophecies of the Christian Era. Translated for the American Edition, with an Introduction and Notes, by HENRY B. SMITH, D.D. 12mo., pp. 463. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.

We turn to Döllinger in the field of investigation here selected as an ultimate authority. Was there ever really a female Pope Joan? How about the heresy of Pope Honorius? Did Huss truly predict the coming of Luther? Was Savonarola actually endowed with prophetic power? This venerable doctor has all the data in reach; he has the brain for ultimate investigation, and the honesty to tell the truth. He is far nearer to infallibility than the plump old gentleman with the three-storied cap down at the Vatican. Our learned papistical controversialists, from time immemorial down to Father Burke, have ever assumed one sure axiom of historical investigation, namely, whatever tells for the Church is true; whatever is adverse is "a Protestant lie."

Educational.

A Manual of American Literature. A Text-book for Schools and Colleges. By JOHN L. HART, LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric in the College of New Jersey. 12mo., pp. 641. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1873.

This is one of a course of volumes intended to induct the scholar into a complete mastery of English and American literature, noticed with commendation in a former "Quarterly." The entire course is constructed on a plan somewhat original and attractive, and, although educational *use* is the true test of practicability, we should judge it from examination to be admirably adapted to the teacher's purposes. The present volume is the result of no little labor in collecting fresh materials for a complete summary of American literature. One original point in the work is that the author has discovered that theology belongs within the range of a nation's literature. Heretofore any mediocrity in poetry, novels, essays, and secular history has been "literature;" but an Edwards, a Barnes, or a Hodge, though master minds in the highest range of thought, have been excluded from that high domain. It is easy to find fault with details in so pioneer a volume. Some may doubt whether the continuance of the plan of grouping a set of writers under one prominent name is desirable in a presentation of *living* authors. Some may wonder why Andrew D. White, who can scarce be considered as an "author" at all, should be spread out to so disproportionate an extent. Methodists will miss the names of Wilbur Fisk, James Floy, and Edward Thomson. And the Church South claims that the book has been too exclusively a northern exposure. Dr. Hart thus finds himself an arbiter of fame, and doubtless knows how to interpret all grumblings into tributes to the dignity of his office and the importance of his work. One volume more, entitled "A Short Course of Literature," now in preparation, will complete his admirable series of five.

A German Reader to succeed the German Course. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 432. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

A German Course adapted to use in Colleges, High-schools, and Academies. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 498. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

The First German Reader, to succeed the "First Book in German." By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 99. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

A Manual of German Conversation, to succeed the German Course. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 238. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

We bring together the volumes of German instruction books by Professor Comfort, the present able Professor of Modern Languages in the Syracuse University. The first of the volumes is

an improvement upon Ollendorf. The second is a series of selections from the most classic authors of Germany, accompanied with notes rich with suggestions in comparative philology. The third is a smaller book of simple lessons. The last is a series of conversations, with English translations, giving a wealth of words, phrases, and information for a traveler in Deutschland. Teachers and professors may find the whole course unrivaled for its purposes.

Literature and Fiction.

The Divine Tragedy. By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. 12mo., pp. 150. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1871.

The Pennsylvania Pilgrim, and other Poems. By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. 12mo., pp. 129. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872.

The Masque of the Gods. By BAYARD TAYLOR. 12mo., pp. 48. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872.

The poets have taken to making their profession of faith. BAYARD TAYLOR summons the leading deity of each past religion successively to the scenes, (Jehovah among them,) and makes a divine "Voice from space" pronounce upon the relative truth, and promise in the future the absolute truth. The Voice authenticates beauty as divine, and, as "God of Love," pronounces EMANUEL to be his "one begotten Son, in whom I am well pleased." Though not a confession of the full truth of the New Testament, the poem is reverent, Christian, hopeful, and wrought out with no little poetic power.

WHITTIER lays aside his clarion and takes up his pastoral reed to show that Quakerism down in Pennsylvania is as worthy a bard and a world-wide commemoration as Puritanism up in New England. Germantown is nobler double to Plymouth. Now we believe in the "inner light;" but the best glimpse we can get at its pure blaze tells us that what Germantown lacked and Plymouth possessed was *power*. This was why Wesley forsook the Moravians. His energetic soul, inspired by a bold, aggressive faith, abandoned the meek brethren to their quiet, and, we fear, too selfish watching the serene candle in the soul. Alas, their candle is dimming away into darkness! The candle ought sometimes to be a blazing torch, cutting the black midnight with its fiery sword, and lighting the way even, if it must be, through war and bloodshed, to truth and freedom.

Fluent and fluid LONGFELLOW has shown how near the Gospels are to poetry. It takes but a few transpositions and extra touches of his golden pen to do the homely evangelists into sweet rhythm. He believes, apparently, in them all, and in the Apostles' Creed

to boot. He can, doubtless, indorse the dying creed of the late assassinated Richardson: "There is a great comfort in believing that Jesus Christ was something more than man."

Miscellaneous.

The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. In two volumes. Volume I. 12mo., pp. 638. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

Mr. Froude's visit and lectures will give a special interest to this work.

University Series. No. IX. The Earth a Great Magnet. A Lecture delivered before the Yale Scientific Club, February 12, 1872. By ALFRED MANHALL MAYER, Ph.D., Professor of Physics in the Stevens Institute of Technology. 12mo., paper cover, pp. 74. New Haven, Conn.: C. C. Chatfield & Co. 1872.

Professor Mayer's Lecture, delivered in free, popular style, on one of the most interesting phases of science, is among the best of Mr. Chatfield's admirable "University Series."

The Psalms. By CARL BERNHARD MOLL, D.D. Translated from the German, with Additions, by Rev. CHARLES BRIGGS, Rev. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D., Rev. JAMES B. HAMMOND, and Rev. J. FRED. M'CURDY. Together with a New Version of the Psalms and Philological Notes, by Rev. THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D. 12mo., pp. 816. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

Our brief examination induces us to believe that this is a very rich contribution to our literature on the Psalms.

Shakspeare's Comedy of the Merchant of Venice. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 168. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Shakspeare's Tragedy of Julius Cæsar. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 189. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Shakspeare's History of King Henry the Eighth. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 210. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Shakspeare's Comedy of The Tempest. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A. M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 148. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

A series of individual master-pieces of the great master, in neat form, and illustrated with valuable notes.

Water and Land. By JACOB ABBOTT. With numerous Engravings. 12mo., pp. 330. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Light. By JACOB ABBOTT. With numerous Engravings. 12mo., pp. 313. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Force. By JACOB ABBOTT. With numerous Engravings. 12mo., pp. 305. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

In this series a very ingenious attempt is made at so blending some of the profoundest problems of science with a familiar narrative as to connect them with daily thought and life, catching the illustrations from constantly occurring objects. Individually we should prefer the science by itself; but there are thousands to whom the science is a pill, and the story the sugar-coating, making the pill "swallowable."

Elsie's Girlhood. By MARTHA FARQUHARSON. 12mo., pp. 422. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
The Lillingstones of Lillingstone. By EMMA JANE WORBOISE. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 423. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
Daniel Boone, the Pioneer of Kentucky. By John S. C. ABBOTT. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 331. Dodd & Mead. 1872.
Granville Valley. By JACOB ABBOTT. 12mo., pp. 346. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
For Conscience' Sake. By the Author of "Alice Lee's Discipline," etc. 12mo., pp. 215. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
Fifteen Years of Prayer in the Fulton-street Meeting. By S. IRÆNEUS PRIME. 12mo., pp. 345. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

The following works received, and notices postponed to next Quarterly:

Blackie's Four Phases of Morals. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.
Whittier's Poems. Complete. J. R. Osgood & Co.

Under the efficient superintendence of Dr. Vincent a great activity prevails in the Sunday-School Department of our Church. The Committee of Instruction has issued a circular announcing the commencement in January of the new course of Bible Study which is based upon the "International Series," but which supplements a CHURCH COURSE comprising "Catechism Number One," "Special Lessons in Bible History, Chronology, and Geography," "Memory Lessons" from Scripture, etc.

This is a grand movement. We wish it abundant success. The following is the FIRST YEAR'S COURSE:

1. TWENTY-FOUR LESSONS IN GENESIS, with Home Readings, occasional Lectures, special class-exercises, etc., by which the whole book of Genesis may be carefully examined.

2. TWENTY-FOUR LESSONS IN MATTHEW, with special studies as above. The design of the "International Committee" is thus set forth in their report: "Some portion of each year (of the seven) will be spent in studying the character and work of Christ—half the first year to his life as recorded by Matthew. During the *second* year similar studies will be suggested in *Mark*, and after that in *Luke* and *John*," etc., etc.

3. MEMORY LESSONS. "The Ten Commandments," "The Lord's Prayer," "The First, Twenty-Third, and One Hundredth Psalms," "The Beatitudes," "The Apostles' Creed," "The Baptismal Covenant."

4. SUPPLEMENTAL LESSONS in the "Bible as a Book," the "Books of the Bible," "Outlines of Bible History, Chronology, and Geography."

5. THE CHURCH CATECHISM. NUMBER ONE.

6. SPECIAL MISSIONARY EXERCISES.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1873.

ART. I.—THE UNITY OF THE PHYSICAL WORLD

Le Ciel Géologique. Prodrome de géologie comparée. Par STANISLAS MEUNIER. Paris. 1871.

Die Spectralanalyse in ihrer Anwendung auf die Stoffe der Erde und die Natur der Himmelskörper, Gemeinfässlich dargestellt. von Dr. H. SCHELLEN. Zweite Auflage. Braunschweig. 1871.

The Heavens. An Illustrated Hand-book of Popular Astronomy. By AMÉDÉE GUILLEMIN. Edited by J. NORMAN LOCKYER, F.R.A.S., F.R.S. Fourth edition. Revised by RICHARD A. PROCTOR, B.A., F.R.A.S. New York. 1871.

Cours élémentaire d'Astronomie. Par M. CH. DELAUNAY. Paris. 1870.

Le Soleil. Exposé de principales découvertes modernes sur la structure de cet astre, son influence dans l'univers et ses rélations avec les autres corps célestes. Par le P. SECCHI, S. J. Paris. 1870.

The Sun: Ruler, Fire, Light, and Life of the Planetary System. By RICHARD A. PROCTOR, B.A., F.R.A.S. London. 1871.

THE six works whose titles are above cited may serve to index a recent progress in cosmical physics which constitutes one of the most noteworthy features of the science of the nineteenth century. They report additions made to our knowledge of the constitution and history of the heavenly bodies during the last ten or fifteen years scarcely equaled by the acquisitions of any previous decade and a half. This recent progress, vast as it is, yields in interest to the promises of the *new status* which has been conferred upon scientific investigation. The sciences are out of their ruts. The time is past when each specialist can spend a life-time over his chosen problems without arousing the interest of laborers in other fields, or hope to

attain to prompt and valid solutions without calling them to his aid—each with such knowledge and appliances as his own labors have placed at his command. A new sympathy among the sciences is awakened. They are beginning to reach a common ground, and to reflect the unity which belongs to the universal system of truth. The sciences are becoming broadened and liberalized; their metes and bounds are less distinctly marked; like the colors of the rainbow, they mutually overlap and blend, and lose all separate identity, save in their dominant features, because, like the colors of the rainbow, they are only the outcome of a varied unity.

The astronomer, seeking for a knowledge of the heavenly bodies, first lays the theory of optics under contribution to improve his power of seeing. Then he finds himself in the midst of a universe animated by mechanical forces, and executing its activities through geometrical forms and along mathematical lines. The astronomer must needs be an optician and a geometer. Next, optics places at his service a peculiar instrument, which, by a marvelous resolution of light from the sun and stars, presents a body of phenomena utterly unintelligible till chemistry steps in and introduces to his acquaintance the guests of the laboratory. Now he calls over the names of sodium, hydrogen, and barium, and they respond to him from star and nebula.

The geologist, beginning with the attempt to unravel the structural arrangement of the materials of the earth, soon discovers that it has had a history—that he must endeavor to trace the successive monuments of this history back to its commencement. He calls upon the mineralogist to expound the constitution of the rocks—the solid records of the history whose reality is disclosed; and the chemist appears, to reduce all things to five or six dozen simples. Soon he discovers evidences of ancient heat, and finds himself involved in experiments upon the actual escape of heat from the earth, and abstruse mathematical calculations in reference to the necessary or possible rate of cooling from any assignable condition.* He penetrates back to a molten state, and here he catches the utterances of the astronomer, gazing through his tube at the

* See especially the researches of Poisson, Fourier, Hopkins, and Thomson, (Sir William.)

sun and the stars. "Igneous vapors," "molten worlds," are reported from the depths of space. "And here," responds the geologist, "in the very world which is our observatory, behold a planetary slag which, some time back, was a 'molten world,' and why not an 'igneous vapor?'" Geology and astronomy join hands and set out in the search for formative worlds which may serve as types of ancient stages of terrestrial history. Later in that history are found the relics of organized creatures, upon which existence has been conferred as the world was fitted for them. The rocky beds of the earth's crust are their tombs, which no sacred scruples restrain the geologist from exploring. With the zoologist upon his right, and the botanist upon his left, he walks among these tombs, and as his companions pronounce the names and alliances of these relics of the organic world he assigns them their respective places in the system of terrestrial preparations, and writes down their respective epochs in the unfolding of the pre-Adamic ages. Thus geology is the resultant of mechanics, thermotics, mathematics, mineralogy, chemistry, astronomy, zoology, and botany, and of all the aids which these sciences summon to their completion and efficiency.

It is this conception of the sources of geological information which M. Meunier has brought into requisition in seeking to retrace the evolution of our world to its beginning. He sees in the present condition of the masses of cosmical matter pictures of a former condition of the earth. Drawing upon the body of astronomical facts, which nowhere find a completer popular statement than in the works of Guillemin, Delaunay, or Chambers,* he presents us an array of evidences demonstrating a unity, not only of the physical sciences, but of the dominion of the forces of matter, and the intelligence which their activities reveal throughout the utmost breadth of the visible universe. The work of Father Secchi, of the "Roman College," is a charming volume, setting forth in fuller detail every thing which is known respecting the sun as a cosmical body. It embraces the results of the Jesuit father's original observations and speculations upon the sun and its relations to the other heavenly bodies, the earliest records of which may be found scattered through the volumes of the *Comtes rendus*

* Chambers' (Geo. F.) "Descriptive Astronomy." 8vo., pp. 816. Oxford, 1867.

of the Académie des Sciences at Paris from 1863 to 1870. Proctor's work, which appeared almost simultaneously, is written with the same object in view, and, like the other, contains a large infusion of originality. The most marvelous recent advances in cosmical physics have been attained through the use of the spectroscope, which has brought us to a knowledge of the chemical constitution of the stars—a mysterious analysis of matter from which we are separated by millions and billions of miles. The philosophy and forms of the spectroscope, and its applications in spectral analysis, are completely set forth and magnificently illustrated in the work of Schellen, which has the further merit of being the most recent work of its class—a prime quality in reports of scientific progress, characterized by such strides as have been taken by spectroscopic research.*

A survey of the field of scientific truth, as set forth in these works, is well adapted to impress the reader with a conviction that all parts of the visible universe appertain to one system of things; that all have proceeded from one commencement, have been actuated by one impulse, have experienced one history, are bound to a common destination; and that each exemplifies, at every moment of its existence, a stage of evolution which is embraced in the life of every other. These facts, so largely reinforced by recent discoveries, reflect important light upon the question of evolution in the material world; but we propose to confine our attention to the scientific proofs of the *co-existent unity* of the system of matter.

I. *The order and uniformities of the solar system.*

(1.) *Orbital motions.* When we lift our thoughts to the contemplation of the planetary system, of which our earth is a member, we are profoundly impressed by the harmony of those silent but majestic movements executed in the depths of space. The noiseless flight of over a hundred worlds about a common center, passing and repassing without collision or mistake, like partners moving through the orderly mazes of a dance, is a

* This work has been translated into English by the daughters of the astronomer Lassell, and edited, with notes, by William Huggins. An edition of the translation is published by Van Nostrand, New York. The subject is also explained in the works of Proctor and Secchi, cited above. Roscoe's "Spectrum Analysis" is also republished in New York; and information conveniently accessible may be found in Chatfield's "University Series," No. VII, and Lee & Shepard's "Half-Hour Recreations in Popular Science," Nos. III, IV, and V.

spectacle well calculated to awaken the emotions of every soul not dead to the sentiment of the sublime.

Eight major planets are known to belong to this system, besides one hundred and twenty-one * minor planets, or asteroids, already discovered. These one hundred and twenty-nine bodies all possess a common orbital motion, from west to east, around the same center, indicating at once that they all belong to one system, regulated by a common law. This conviction is strengthened when we observe that the several orbits possess the same mathematical properties, and that the planets move with corresponding velocities in corresponding parts of their orbits. The orbits, for instance, as expressed by the first law of Kepler, are all ellipses, with the sun situated in one of their foci; while the motions of all the planets are most rapid when in their lower apsides—or those parts of their orbits nearest the sun—and slowest at the opposite extremities of their orbits. Moreover, it appears from mathematical demonstration that the orbital motion of every planet is capable of being caused by the action of two forces—the one a *tangential impulse*, giving the planet a motion through space, which, from the inertia of matter, would be continuous, the other a *constant* force, acting in the direction of the center of gravity of the sun, with an intensity varying directly as the masses and inversely as the square of the planet's distance from the sun.

In the next place it will be observed that these orbits all lie in nearly the same absolute plane, suggesting that the planetary movements have all been generated under uniform circumstances. They do not present the spectacle of a swarm of bees, darting in every conceivable direction through space, each actuated by an independent impulse, but rather the consonant and rhythmical movements of a fleet of ships wafted onward by a common breeze.

The orderly arrangements of the planets in respect to distances from the sun must also be noted. They revolve at regularly graduated distances. No clashing can ever occur. Moreover, there are mathematical relations existing between

* The one hundred and eighteenth was discovered, March 15, 1872, by Dr. Luther, of Bilk; the one hundred and nineteenth, April 3, by Prof. Watson, of Ann Arbor; the one hundred and twentieth, April 10, by Borelli, of Naples; and the one hundred and twenty-first, May 12, by Watson.

their velocities, periodic revolutions, and distances from the sun, which are the same for all the planets, and show that the same physical laws extend throughout the solar system. These relations are known as the second and third laws of Kepler, and are thus enunciated:

2. *The radius vector of any planet* (that is, the line from the planet to the center of its motion) *sweeps over equal areas in equal times.*

3. *The squares of the periodic times of the planets are to each other as the cubes of their mean distances from the sun.*

These relations are absolutely fixed, and they demonstrate that one dominion extends to the utmost limits of the solar system.

(2.) *Satellites.* A further correspondence among the several members of this system is the presence of secondary planets revolving about five of them. The earth is accompanied by one satellite, Jupiter by four, Saturn by eight, Uranus by six or eight, and Neptune by one or more. Each satellite revolves about its primary in an elliptic orbit, having the primary planet in one of the foci. The direction of the orbital motion of the satellites, like that of the primaries, is from west to east—except that the satellites of Uranus, and probably of Neptune, exhibit a retrograde motion, from east to west. Could we suppose that the direction of the original motion, in the systems of Uranus and Neptune, was from west to east, and that, by some convulsion, those systems had been bodily overturned, it is apparent that the same actual motion of the satellites, in reference to their primaries, would become a *reversed* motion in reference to the earth, or any other fixed point in space. This may be illustrated to the eye by the use of a watch. When the watch lies upon its back, the extremities of the pointers represent satellites having a *direct* motion. In that part of their circuit nearest the observer that motion is from right to left; or, if the person be facing southward toward the belt, where the planetary bodies appear, the motion is from *west to east.* If now the watch be inverted, so as to lie on its face, the extremities of the pointers move from left to right, a motion which, transferred to the southern heavens, as before, becomes retrograde—that is, a motion from east to west.* If it were

* The orbital motions here referred to must not be confounded with the appar-

admissible, therefore, to suppose that, since the birth of the systems of Uranus and Neptune, they have undergone an inversion in space, it appears that, notwithstanding the anomaly which they present, their rotations in respect to themselves are in the same direction as the motions of the other systems;* and they are thus original parts of what appears to be a common effect traceable to a general cause responsible for the uniform movements executed throughout the solar system.

(3.) *Axial motions.* In the next place, all the planetary bodies revolve upon their own axes. It is further remarkable that the axial motions are all in the same direction, and that this direction is the same as that in which the planets revolve in their orbits. It is probable, however, that Uranus and Neptune have a retrograde motion, like their satellites; but this, as before, may be explained on the hypothesis of an inversion of those planets. The sun, also, and moon, have axial rotations in the same direction. We witness, then, the spectacle of probably more than a hundred cosmical bodies, all spinning about their axes with silent and ceaseless velocity, as if some common cause had affected all alike. It is as if the Almighty Hand had taken each in succession and set it whirling, as the boy spins his top upon the floor—each dancing off in due order, but with uniform motion, until the last two are reached, when the planetary tops were inverted, and set to spinning upon their handles. There could scarcely be a spectacle accessible to human intelligence more convincing than the planetary motions, that one plan and one purpose reign throughout the realm of the solar system. Such Kepler confessed to be the impression made upon his mind by the contemplation of the harmonious movements of the heavenly bodies; and such was the confession of Newton. "The wisdom of the Lord is infinite," says Kepler, "as are also his glory and his power. Ye heav-

ent daily movement of the heavenly bodies from east to west, caused by the rotation of the earth upon its axis. These orbital motions, as in the case of our own moon, are revealed by the appearance of the same planet, on each successive evening, a *little further eastward* among the constellations.

*This hypothesis is favored by the circumstance that the inversion of the system of Uranus is not complete—having been carried but little beyond a quarter of a circumference. We might homologize the attitude of these satellites by saying that they have an inclination of about one hundred and one degrees to the plane of their ecliptic, while our moon has an inclination of only five degrees.

ens, sing his praises! Sun, moon, and planets, glorify him in your ineffable language; praise him, celestial harmonies, and all ye who can comprehend them!"* Such language sounds more like a psalm of David than the conclusion of a learned scientific treatise. "The Master of the heavens," says Newton, "governs all things. . . . He is the one God and the same God every-where and always." . . . †

(4.) *Planetary Forms.* The rain-drop takes the form of a sphere, and so does the molten lead falling from the summit of the shot-tower. The physicist informs us that this is the *natural* form of every detached body of matter whose particles are free to adjust themselves according to an inherent law of the mass. A moment's reflection on the nature of a central force will convince any one that no other form is possible among a body of particles each equally drawn toward a common center of gravity. But what interests us most is the fact that the planetary bodies, hundreds and thousands of millions of miles distant from our earth, have felt and manifested the urgency of the same law. The planets, primary and secondary, have all shaped themselves after the model of the rain-drop. We have so long heard that the planetary bodies are spherical that we cease to reflect on the meaning of the fact; but this common form implies that the totality of matter within the orbit of Neptune subsists under the government of one empire whose laws are enforced equally in the midst of a Newfoundland fog, in the immense globe of the solar flame, and in the solid body of Neptune shivering on the frozen verge of the realm of planetary existence.

(5.) *Physiographic Features of the Planets.* The superficial characters of the planetary bodies, so far as we have been able to learn them, present marked analogies with those of our own planet. The surface of the moon, as is well known, is distinctly diversified by mountain, valley, and plain. A large number of the summits present crater-like forms with enormous gorges variously grouped about, and have generally been regarded as monuments of extinct volcanic action. In respect to climate the planet Mars furnishes distinct evidences of a close analogy with the earth. His succession of seasons must

* Kepler: *Harmonices Mundi, libri quinque.*

† Newton: *Philosophiæ naturalis principia mathematica.*

be similar to our own. It is alternately winter and summer in each hemisphere. Accordingly, the shining mantle of snow is seen to gradually extend itself toward the equator in the hemisphere turned away from the sun, and to gradually retreat during the other half of the Martial year. The snow mantle which covers the polar regions of the earth must exhibit a similar annual advance and retreat to observers upon the planet Mars. Finally, the last-named planet, which seems, indeed, in many respects, to be the nearest analogue of the earth, offers a distribution of land and water which strongly suggests the hydrographic arrangements of our own planet. The equatorial regions are mainly occupied by four large continents, which are separated by vast oceans diversified by islands and connected by straits, protruding, in some places, broad gulfs into the borders of the land, and in others sending out long tortuous inlets, one of which attains the length of 3,000 miles, and must be essentially similar to the mediterranean channel which connected the Gulf of Mexico with the Arctic Ocean in the Mesozoic age of terrestrial history.

The atmosphere of this planet possesses physical properties similar to our own. It is charged with vapors and gases, and floating clouds make beautiful its evening sunsets and its morning sunrises, and not unfrequently fierce storms sweep over the surface of the planet, obscuring it to telescopic vision.*

The surface of Mercury is known to be diversified by valleys and mountains, and one of the latter is thought to be no less than eleven miles in height. Schröter believed that he detected the existence of an active volcano. Venus is believed to be enveloped in an atmosphere, and to present great inequalities of surface, exceeding even those upon the surface of Mercury. During the transits of these planets across the sun's disc several observers have reported seeing grayish light spots, which rotate with the planets. Schröter, Harding, Fritsch, and Moll have seen them in transits of Mercury, and at least one observer detected such a spot during a transit of Venus.†

* Lockyer: "Mem. Royal Astronom. Soc.," vol. xxxii, p. 183. On the analogies of Mars and the Earth see, besides the works cited, Proctor: "Other Worlds than Ours," chap. iv.

† Chambers: "Descriptive Astronomy," book ii, chap. iv

Such spots possibly mark the sites of active volcanoes. Jupiter is believed to be furnished with an atmosphere in which float vast changing belts of watery vapor, and similar opinions are entertained in reference to the body of the planet Saturn.

Such are the most striking phenomena which evince the existence of a bond of relationship binding the members of the solar system in a unity. It seems impossible to contemplate the variety and complexity of the movements of these planetary bodies, and the incessant responses which they yield to each other's perturbating influences, without being struck with admiration of the harmony, security, and stability with which they move in their appointed courses, and the simplicity of the primal forces to which all these phenomena may be traced. Given the force of gravity and a single impulse, and the life-time of a planet can be charted. Supposing the earth created and placed at the distance of 91,500,000 miles from the sun, gravity alone would produce a fall upon the sun. But if at the same instant, or at any time during its fall, another force, however slight, should give the earth a push in a direction across its line of descent, the earth would pass by the sun, and fly onward to the distance of 91,500,000 miles beyond, when it would return and pass the sun on the opposite side, and thus an orbital motion would be established. If the tangential impulse were nearly equal to the centripetal attraction, and directed at right angles to the line of descent, the elliptic path described would approximate nearly to the actual form of the earth's orbit. If the line of the tangential force should not pass through the earth's center of gravity, a *rotation* would be generated as well as an orbital motion.

Further, since the several planets revolve about the sun in the same direction, and in nearly the same plane, it is apparent that the tangential impulse which may have imparted to each its orbital and axial motions must have acted in one plane and in the same direction; and though it seems to have acted along lines at different distances from the sun, it is conceivable that it may have been a single cause which, at the periods of birth of the several planets, may have assumed these different positions in accordance with some intelligible law of change.

Now science has long reflected upon these circumstances,

and has framed a *hypothesis* in accordance with which these varied movements of the planetary bodies may be traced back to a common condition, molded and actuated by a common impulse, and launched in accordance with a uniform plan into that state of delicate equipoise between centripetal and centrifugal forces which so excites our admiration and amazement. We say it was originally a "hypothesis," as the doctrine of gravitation was originally a hypothesis; but like that hypothesis, this has gradually developed into a settled doctrine of science, which is gaining the general acceptance of the best physicists and astronomers throughout the world. It is not our purpose at present to furnish an exposition or systematic proof of the hypothesis, but simply to suggest the culmination of a series of phenomena and relations which bind our whole assemblage of planetary bodies in the intimate and inseparable unity of a single family.

II. *Extension of the laws of the solar system to the fixed stars.*

(1.) *Distances of the stars.* Vast as the interval from the sun to the remotest planet, it is insignificant compared with the gulf of space which intervenes between Neptune and the fixed stars. Neptune is about 2,745,000,000 miles distant from the sun; but Alpha Centauri, the nearest star, is removed 7,466 times that distance, or 20,496,000,000,000 miles. It will convey some idea of the relative values of these numbers to state that if we represent the distance of Neptune from the sun by a line eight (7.8) inches in length, the distance of the earth from the sun will correspond to a line one quarter (0.26) of an inch in length, and the distance of Alpha Centauri will correspond to a line *one mile in length.* If we reduce the distance of Alpha Centauri to one hundred feet, the distance of Neptune would be eighteen ten thousandths (0.0018) of an inch, which is about *one sixth the diameter of a human hair.*

On the same scale of representation as before, the star 61 Cygni will be removed to the distance of 2.4 miles; Vega, 5.9 miles; Sirius, the brightest of the stars, 6.1 miles; Iota Ursæ Majoris, 6.9 miles; Arcturus, 7.2 miles; Polaris, 13.7 miles; Capella, 20.0 miles. These are the distances of stars scattered about the nearest outskirts of the firmament. The great mass of the fixed stars lies hundreds of times as remote as these. Sir William Herschel believed that he reached with his great

telescope, stars which lie 2,300 times the average distance of stars of the first magnitude, and yet we possess abundant evidence that throughout this vast realm stretches but one physical empire.

TABLE OF DISTANCES FROM THE SUN.*

Objects.	Radii of Earth's Orbit.	Millions of Miles.	Proportional.	Time for Passage of Light.
Earth	1	91½	0.26 in.	8 m. 18 sec.
Neptune	30	2,745	8.8 in.	4 h. 9 m.
Aphelion, Donati's Comet	238	22,000	5 ft. 2 in.	33 h.
" Comet of 1861 (i)	440	40,121	9 ft. 6 in.	61 h.
" Comet of 1844 (ii)	4,000	368,000	86 ft. 8 in.	20 d. 18 h.
Alpha Centauri	224,000	20,496,000	1 mile.	3.537 yrs.
61 Cygni	550,920	50,409,000	2.4 mile.	8.49 "
Vega	1,330,700	121,759,000	5.9 "	20.87 "
Sirius	1,375,000	125,812,000	6.1 "	21.58 "
Iota Ursæ Majoris	1,550,800	142,356,000	6.9 "	24.41 "
Arcturus	1,622,800	148,486,000	7.2 "	25.47 "
Polaris	3,078,600	281,692,000	13.7 "	48.46 "
Capella	4,484,000	410,286,000	20.0 "	70.74 "

(2.) *Comets.* Besides the planets belonging to our system, there are already known thirty-six mysterious bodies, called comets, which also revolve with regularity about the sun. Though the amount of matter which they possess is astonishingly insignificant, and their substance is of such tenuity that the light of the stars has been seen to shine through it, they move in their appointed orbits with nearly the same regularity as the ponderous planets, and all the phenomena of their motions have been explained on the same physical theory. Some of these comets, in receding from the neighborhood of the sun, retire no further than the orbit of Jupiter; others fly onward to the distance of Uranus; while Halley's comet travels 338,000,000 miles beyond the orbit of Neptune, and occupies seventy-seven years in its revolution. Still others penetrate the starless void to greater depths, and yet signify their allegiance to the laws of the solar system. Donati's comet has a

* The quantities in this table have been calculated from Stone's corrected parallax of the sun, (8."91.) Should the earth's distance from the sun be taken at ninety-two millions of miles, the quantities in the last three columns, beginning with Neptune, will have to be increased $\frac{1}{183}$ part of their value. The time required for the passage of light from the sun to the earth is taken from Delaunay, (Op. Cit., p. 331.) Sir John Herschel puts it at 8 m. 13."5. ("Familiar Lectures on Scientific Subjects," p. 227.)

period of 2,100 years, and travels 229,000,000,000 of miles from the sun. The comet of 1811 has gone on a journey of 3,000 years; the comet of 1680 is expected to be absent 8,814 years; while the comet of July, 1844, is under pledge to report at the headquarters of our system after an absence of 100,000 years; During this journey it travels to the distance of 368,000,000,000 of miles from the sun, and yet throughout the utmost limits of their flight these mysterious wisps of luminous vapor acknowledge every hour their allegiance to the central authority of our system. There is not a moment when the gentle influence of our sun ceases to be felt. Across the silent and measureless void the subtle power of gravitation manifests its presence as distinctly as in the falling acorn in the forest.

These comets all move, of course, in elliptic orbits. A large majority of them possess a *direct motion*, and conform approximately to the plane of the ecliptic. These are circumstances which intimate an alliance with our system, as well as a subjection to the general laws of matter.*

But there are other comets which venture beyond the boundary line which separates the empire of our sun from some contiguous dominion. From time to time these unrecognized strangers plunge, unannounced, into the midst of our planetary system, hurry with excited haste to the neighborhood of our solar center, whirl round their perihelion, and dart forth again into the abyss of space, *never to return.* There can be little doubt that the non-periodic comets pass within the influence of other solar centers, around which they swing with similar haste, to dart off again to the neighborhood of other suns. These strange comets move, while within the limits of our system, in accordance with the same laws as the periodic comets, and their places can be similarly calculated from day to day, and from week to week; but as their paths are parabolic and hyperbolic curves, their very flight from the local government of our system is as much the subject of mathematical demonstration as is the return of comets moving in elliptic orbits. It cannot be doubted that if they visit other suns it is to acknowl-

* All comets moving in hyperbolic orbits also have a direct motion, and thus furnish other intimations of some connection between their history and that of the planetary bodies. Delaunay, however, (Op. Cit., p. 644,) is of the opinion that all comets are either strangers, or only naturalized denizens in the solar system.

edge still their allegiance to the supreme force of gravitation, and to travel in paths which might become as strictly the subjects of computation as the paths described by them outside the limits of our system.*

Thus these wanderers range from sun to sun, from system to system, impelled ever by one force, regulated every-where by one government, weaving the visible universe into a compact web of indissoluble relationships.†

(3.) *Stellar Phenomena.* Still other intimations reach us. Viewed with the telescope, many of the fixed stars appear double. We know at least 6,000 of them. Not less than 650 of the double stars are demonstrated to be real systems, physically connected, revolving about a common center of gravity between them. The periods of their revolutions range from 14 to 1,200 years. The following are examples: A pair in Coma Berenices is thought to have a period as short as 14 years; Zeta Herculis revolves in 36 years; Sirius, in 49¼; Zeta Cancri, in 59; Xi Ursæ Majoris, in 61; Mu Coronæ Borealis, in 66; Alpha Centauri, in 81; Pi Ophiuchi, in 92; Gamma Virginis, in 150; 61 Cygni, in 520; and Gamma Leonis is thought to have a period of 1,200 years.

These, also, are real orbital motions, manifested at such distances that even light, traveling 186,000 miles a second, would require years to reach us. Not only that; these orbits are also ellipses. Now there can be no orbital motion except under the action of centripetal and centrifugal forces: *gravity and inertia are there.* And since the velocity of rotation—to give a centrifugal force equal to the centripetal—must increase with the intensity of the centripetal, that is, the gravitating force, physicists have been enabled to calculate even the weight of distant suns revolving about their centers. Thus, we know that the mass of 61 Cygni is one third the mass of our own sun; and that Alpha Centauri is one tenth the sun's mass.

A remarkable illustration of the truth of that generalization which extends the laws of gravity to these depths in space has recently been furnished. Certain minute movements of Sirius,

* Watson: "A Popular Treatise on Comets," pp. 328, 358, 359, 361.

† "Toutes les parties de notre monde planétaire auraient donc une origine commune, et le système tout entier serait en communication avec les systèmes étrangers par l'intermédiaire des comètes et des météores."—Secchi: "Le Soleil," p. 383.

the brightest star in our heavens, led Bessel to suspect the existence of a small companion-star revolving about it, and exerting a perturbating influence. Such companion was afterward, in 1862, actually discovered by Mr. Alvan Clark, an American observer.

Not only do we find stars thus swinging about in couples, but, in other instances, we find them grouped in threes, fours, and even higher systems, all rotating about a common center. Thus, Theta Orionis, a star scarcely visible to the naked eye, in the celebrated nebula of Orion, resolves itself, under the telescope, into seven mutually connected suns.

Another stellar phenomenon of great interest, though not as yet demonstrably explained, is that of variable stars. Though numerous cases of irregular variability are known, we refer here to such stars as increase and decrease in brightness through regular periods, like the celebrated stars Mira in the whale and Algol in the head of Medusa.

Two explanations have hitherto been offered of such phenomena. Perhaps the periodical variations are due to the rotation of these bodies upon their axes, combined with unequal luminosity on different sides.* Perhaps they are caused by partial occultations by dark planetary bodies revolving about them. Both these explanations equally presume the existence of movements in the depths of space, which can only be regulated by the laws of central forces which hold such imperial sway within the limits of our own system.

More recently, variability has been attributed by M. Faye† to the effects of different phases of refrigeration. Father Secchi,‡ and after him M. Stanislaus Meunier,§ connects variability with the phenomenon of "spots" so well known as marking the surface of our sun, and, by their regular increase and diminution through intervals of about ten years, imparting a variable character to the solar light. These physicists main-

* Zöllner, Stewart, Klinkerfues. This explanation requires *regularity* in the periodicity of the stars.

† Faye: "*Révue des Cours Scientifiques*," t. iii, p. 617.

‡ Secchi: "Op. Cit.," pp. 404–5.

§ Meunier: "Op. Cit.," p. 160.

tain that spots, periodicity and total disappearance of stars, are but different degrees of one phenomenon, and that they are caused by a diffusion or eruption of heated currents from the central non-luminous and more highly heated portion, through the photospheric, partially cooled envelope. The plausibility of this explanation rests on the truth of Secchi's theory (adopted and elaborated by Faye) of the gaseous and non-luminous condition of the solar nucleus. Should this explanation prove true, the) phenomenon of variability still serves as a link of connection between our system and the remotest regions of space, since, by all admissions, our sun is a variable star.*

(4.) *Firmamental movements.* Nearly all the stars called "fixed" are in actual motion. They do not all move with uniform apparent velocity, nor in a uniform direction. These movements, moreover, are, to our eyes, extremely slow. To travel across a space in the heavens equal to the apparent diameter of the moon's disc, would require from 300 to 1,500 years and upward. Of course, nothing can be known of the actual velocity of these motions, except in the case of stars whose distances have been determined. The following are examples of these: Arcturus moves 54 miles a second; 61 Cygni, 40 miles; Capella, 30; Sirius, 14; Alpha Centauri, 13; Vega, 13; Polaris, 1½. For purposes of comparison, we may state that the earth moves in her orbit with a mean velocity of nineteen miles a second; the other planets, with velocities varying from three to thirty miles a second; and the sun has a proper motion in space (as we shall presently explain) of about four miles a second.

Thus the stars called "fixed," and which are used as points of comparison for all our observations on the motions of the planets, are themselves in perpetual motion. In consequence of their unequal motions, certain stars will travel, in the course of time, out of the constellations with which astronomy has identified them for three thousand years.

Isolated and unconformable movements among the stars

* Proctor: "The Sun," pp. 197–9; Secchi: "Le Soleil," pp. 113–117; Chambers: "Desc. Astron.," pp. 14, 15; Loomis: "Sun Spots," etc., in "Amer. Jour. Sci.," [2,] vol. l, p. 153, *et seq.* We are indebted to the patient observations of Schwabe of Dessau for this determination.

might not clearly appear referable to the same physical causes as we find acting within the limits of our system. Proctor,* however, has clearly shown that groups of stars are characterized by a common "drift." Not all the stars within a circumscribed space can be reasonably imagined to sustain a physical connection with each other, since many of those which, to our eyes, are most closely approximated, may be at enormously unequal distances. Such, however, as manifest a common motion, may fairly be regarded as moving under uniform conditions. Even this, however, does not demonstrate that those conditions are reproduced in the solar system; but the suggestion is probable.

Again, our own sun is one of the stars manifesting a proper motion. This motion is revealed by the slow opening of the ranks of the stars in one part of the heavens, and their gradual closing together in the opposite quarter. Such apparent motions of the stars remain, after making all allowance for their real motions. Thus our sun is traveling onward, with all his retinue of planets and satellites, toward a point in the constellation Hercules, and at a rate of 153,000,000 miles a year. Astronomers are of the opinion that this proper motion of the sun is directed in an orbit whose center is in the Pleiades, and whose circumference is so vast that 18,200,000 years are required for a single revolution.

This probable revolution of the solar system about a center within our firmament renders it probable that the proper motions of the other stars are also due to orbital movements about the same center. Thus we shall be led to contemplate the starry firmament with its 77,000,000 of suns, as an example of a solar system on a more stupendous scale.

There is still another order of stellar existences to which attention ought to be directed. More than five thousand nebulæ have already been laid down on the map of the heavens. Their ordinary appearance is that of a faint luminous cloud spread on the dark background of the sky. Very many of these, subjected to the scrutiny of the telescope, resolve themselves into stars and "star-dust," or minute points of light. Others defy all power of resolution.

It seems quite certain that some of the nebulæ lie within

* Proctor: "Other Worlds than Ours," pp. 277–281; "The Sun," pp. 428–9.

the limits of our firmament of stars. The tendency of some modern astronomers is to the opinion that all the nebulæ are confined to distances no greater than the stars. Should this opinion become established, there are still some phenomena presented by the nebulæ which seem to indicate central gravitation and rotary motion. While many are more or less irregular, others present a spherical (or at least a circular) form. Others are beautifully annular. Still others, as the nebula in Argo, present parabolic curves resembling the tails of comets; and others, finally, like the nebulæ in Canes Venatici and Virgo, are strikingly spiral. All these forms are irresistibly suggestive of central forces and axial rotations.

But the common opinion of astronomers seems to be in accord with that of the Herschels, that probably very many of the nebulæ are really other firmaments of stars wholly external to ours, and removed to distances proportionate to the vast interstellar spaces of our own firmament. Our firmament, according to the system of gauging the star-depths employed by Sir William Herschel, is circumscribed by a definite boundary, and presents somewhat the form of a grindstone cleft around a portion of its periphery. It is true that the telescope reveals a multitude of stars not seen by the unaided eye; and, as the power increases, star after star rises in the far-off horizon of our view, till it would seem that the number is infinite and boundless. But our firmament has its outer periphery. When the most powerful instruments are steadily turned toward even the most populous portion of the sky, the vision threads its cold and devious way from rank to rank of glittering suns, till, finally, it stands upon the outer ramparts of the firmament and looks out upon immensity. What solemn emotions fill the soul when it succeeds in traveling beyond the stars, and gazes through the loop-holes of the firmament upon the blackness and emptiness beyond!

But what of the realms of space beyond the boundaries of our star-system? Across that dark and pathless interval the telescope has led our vision, and lo! upon the remotest confines of the universe hangs a faint film of light, like the feeble glow of a watchman's lamp upon the shore of a cold and dark and trackless sea. In other quarters of the heavens are other patches of light, the counter existences of this. These are the

nebulæ; and such, according to current views of stellar astronomy,* are their relative positions and distances.

Should such views be finally confirmed, we shall discover still stronger analogies with the phenomena of the solar system, and stretching over intervals of space too vast for even the imagination to span.

There is good ground for doubting, however, whether mere clouds of luminous vapor, which most of the irresolvable nebulæ are supposed to be, would be visible to human eyes if really so far external to our firmament. Since some of the irresolvable nebulous matters have shown such a connection with stars as to demonstrate that they belong to our stellar system, it may be most reasonable to assume that all irresolvable nebulæ are thus associated. Accordingly only resolvable nebulæ would be regarded as external, while the irresolvable nebulæ would be only specimens of formative matter in various stages of differentiation. This view is sustained by the existence of so-called nebulous stars and planetary nebulæ, in which the irresolvable nebulous matter presents itself condensed toward the center into a state of greater luminosity, which, in many examples, approaches or reaches the appearance of a veritable star or couple of stars.†

(5.) *Inferences from the movements of light.* Whether orbital and axial motions, and other evidences of the presence of gravity, be traced to the distances of the fixed stars and nebulæ or not, this proof of community of conditions certainly exists, that the flight of the luminous ray proclaims identical laws throughout the visible universe. Light is a phenomenon universally regarded as arising from inconceivably but measurably rapid vibrations of a subtile material fluid commonly known as ether.‡ Wherever light penetrates there is ether.

* Sir John Herschel: "Outlines of Astronomy," 4th ed., p. 537; "Treatise on Astronomy," Am. ed., 1851, chap. xii; "Familiar Lectures on Science," p. 215; Nichol: "Architecture of the Heavens," letter i; Guillemin: "The Heavens," p. 366. On the contrary, see Proctor: "Other Worlds than Ours," chap. xii; Rorison: "Replies to Essays and Reviews," pp. 270, 271; Whewell: "Plurality of Worlds," p. 142.

† For striking examples see the figures of Delaunay: "Op. Cit.," pp. 635, 636, 638.

‡ Aside from the necessity of some such medium for the propagation of light, and, as some of the latest speculations indicate, for the propagation of electricity also, the evidence for the existence of an ethereal fluid rests on slight disturbances

To the remotest star—to the remotest nebulæ—this tenuous fluid fills immensity; and throughout the height and depth, the length and breadth of the empire of matter, this omnipresent element is quick with the tremors generated by millions of suns. Light flies 186,000 miles in a second of time. The solar beam falls to the earth in eight and one third minutes, and reaches the orbit of Neptune in four hours. The light of the nearest star has occupied three and a half years in reaching us, and that of the remotest star which shows a parallax, seventy years. The light from the most distant star which shed a discernible light in the great telescope of Sir William Herschel had left its source eight thousand years before. Eminent authorities entertain the belief that light from some of the distant nebulæ must have occupied 700,000 years in reaching the earth.*

What a conception is here for the mind to dwell upon! What proof of the age of the material universe, and its extent! Yet the same ether, like an ocean bathing continents on its opposite shores, pulsates through the systems of earth, sun, Arcturus, Polaris, and vanishing nebulæ. "It is LIGHT," says Sir John Herschel,† "*and the free communication of it from*

in the movements of certain comets of short period, especially Encke's. Mr. A. Hall ("Amer. Jour. Sci.," [3,] ii, p. 404) has recently raised a doubt in reference to the correctness of the explanation of the retardation of Encke's comet. Professor W. Stanley Jevons, also, in a late number of the London "Chemical News," attributes the retardation of the comet to electricity, and regards the hypothesis of a resisting medium as entirely imaginary. It is worthy of consideration, however, that the ethereal fluid, if it possess the properties of matter, must be increased in density and resisting power in the vicinity of great masses of matter, especially the sun; and that, hence, other things being equal, those comets having the shortest perihelion distances will experience the greatest effects. It is also worthy of remembrance that possibly the uniform motions of the planets about the sun may have imparted a vortical movement to the ether, which would accelerate or retard the motions of comets in accordance with their relation to the direction of the ethereal current. This would diminish its effect on all the comets of short period, since they all have direct motion. It must not be presumed, however, that this fluid is necessarily subject to the law of gravitation, and is possessed in every respect of the properties of ordinary matter. The nature of the ethereal medium, which the almost unanimous judgment of physicists holds to exist, is, at the present moment, the object of the profoundest researches and speculations. (Sir John Herschel: "Familiar Lectures on Scientific Subjects," lect. viii; Mac Vicar: "A Sketch of a Philosophy," parts ii, iii.)

* Guillemin: "The Heavens," p. 366.

† Sir John Herschel: "Familiar Lectures," p. 218.

the remotest regions of the universe, which alone can give, and does fully give us, the assurance of a uniform and all-pervading energy—a mechanism almost beyond conception complex, minute, and powerful, by which that influence, or rather that movement, is propagated. Our evidence of the existence of gravitation fails us beyond the region of the double stars, or leaves us, at best, only a presumption, amounting to a moral conviction, in its favor. But the argument for a unity of design and action afforded by light stands unweakened by distance, and is co-extensive with the universe itself."

(6.) *Revelations of the spectroscope.* The culminating proof of identical conditions throughout the physical universe has been furnished by the spectroscope. This little instrument, of recent invention, takes the slender ray of light admitted through a narrow slit, and subjects it to a peculiar scrutiny —a searching examination, which extorts from it the secret of its origin, and of the body which sent it forth, and of the medium through which it has traveled. We can offer but a few words of explanation of this mysterious process, referring to the works of Schellen, Roscoe, Huggins, Lockyer, Brewster, Angström, and others, for fuller information.

Every one knows that solar light passed through a prism of glass undergoes decomposition into its seven primary colors, which may be projected on the opposite wall. Under proper adjustments this colored spectrum may be seen crossed by numerous dark lines. Light proceeding from other luminous sources presents other phenomena. The results of extended experiments upon artificial lights have established the three following principles:

1. The spectrum of an incandescent solid or liquid is continuous, that is, it presents no lines across it.

2. The spectrum of a glowing vapor or gas is crossed by numerous bright lines, and each different vapor gives a different set of bright lines.

3. The spectrum of an incandescent solid or liquid shining through a vapor (dark or incandescent) of lower temperature than the source of the light is crossed by numerous dark lines, and these dark lines occupy the same positions as the bright lines proper to the spectrum of the vapor.

From the third law it appears that vapors transmitting light

from an incandescent solid or liquid, *absorb* exactly the same rays which they would themselves emit if incandescent. Light shining through the vapors of sodium presents a certain set of dark lines; but if the vapors of sodium are rendered incandescent, they produce a set of bright lines occupying exactly the places of the dark ones. This set of dark lines across any spectrum becomes, therefore, the evidence of the presence of sodium in the vapors through which the light passes.

Now, dark lines, as we said, cross the spectrum of the sun. This, first of all, proves that the light of the sun emanates from an incandescent solid or liquid, and passes through vapors of lower temperature in escaping to the earth. How sudden and unexpected a revelation of its constitution! *A liquid nucleus with an envelope of glowing clouds.**

But certain ones of these dark lines occupy exactly the positions of the bright lines of the spectrum of sodium. The vapor of sodium is therefore present in the gaseous envelope of the sun! Sodium is one of our most common substances. It is the basis of common salt consumed at every human meal. It gives the saltness to the waters of the universal ocean. This most familiar element enters largely into the constitution of the sun.

But another set of the dark lines of the solar spectrum corresponds to the bright lines of the spectrum of hydrogen. Now hydrogen is one of the two constituents of all the water which belongs to our planet. It is also a constituent of coal, of petroleum, and of all vegetable and animal substances. This familiar element abounds also in the sun!

Nor is this all. Physicists have studied these magical lines of the solar spectrum until they have detected the existence of sundry other substances in the constitution of the sun. We find there not only sodium and hydrogen, but iron, magnesium, barium, copper, zinc, calcium, chromium, nickel, and prob-

* Father Secchi does not regard the liquid nucleus fully proven. The dark spectral lines would result if the photosphere of the sun were in such a state of condensation as to present an analogy to *mist*, and thus shine as a liquid; while the absorbent medium might be a non-luminous atmosphere external to the photosphere. Thus the central portion of the sun might be a non-luminous gas, (Secchi: "Op. Cit.," pp. 104–6.) Though this theory is adopted by M. Faye, ("Comtes rendus," 16 and 23 Jan., 1865; 27 July, 1868, tom. lxviii, 197,) we feel constrained to regard the doctrine of a molten nucleus the most plausible.

ably, also, cobalt, strontium, cadmium, and potassium. These include nearly all our common elements. Iron is disseminated through all the rocks, and, in places, is accumulated in mountain masses. Calcium is the basis of chalk and all limestones, and enters into the constitution of a large proportion of the other rocks. Magnesium, under the guise of dolomite, constitutes extensive geological formations, and enters, besides, as a common constituent, into other minerals and rock-masses. Verily, it would seem that earth and sun have been molded out of the same lump of material. Were earth a daughter of the sun, she could not more completely have inherited the traits of her mother.

With what breathless interest were the questionings of this little instrument addressed to the stars! And how satisfactorily did they respond! *Dark* lines cross their spectra as in that of the sun. They are, then, *other suns;* they shine by their own light; their luminous spheres are enveloped in vapors, whose light-vibrations are attuned in unison with those excited by the spheres themselves.

But what are the substances whose interferences silence certain of these starry rays? Are they known, or are they stranger elements? How sublimely instructive the response, as we see it handed down from Aldebaran and Betelguese and Sirius. Sodium is also there, and magnesium and iron and calcium. Yes, one kind of matter forms the substance of the solar system and the starry firmament. The dust of our streets is ignited to starry suns in Arcturus and the Pleiades.

There is one step further. Will the nebulæ respond to our interrogatories? We do not mean the revolvable nebulæ for these, of course, will give us star-light;* but what of the cloudy nebulæ which stubbornly refuse to be resolved? They have sent down their response; the lines of their spectra are

* There are, indeed, resolvable nebulæ which give us bright-line spectra. Their separate stars are therefore merely segregated patches of the luminous vapor, which in many cases appears more continuous in the regions more removed from the center. These phenomena are full of suggestions bearing upon theories of stellar genesis.

It may be as well to add that not a few celestial objects afford us a continuous spectrum—having neither bright nor dark lines. This is true of several dense star-clusters, as well as of a number of resolvable nebulæ. The continuous spectrum may indicate that these bodies are incandescent solids or liquids, or

bright instead of dark! They are luminous vapors. How promptly and how eagerly they testify. How long have they waited for this opportunity to reveal the vastness of the ONE CREATOR'S empire! These cloudy nebulæ are not, then, other firmaments of stars, but starry material to be wrought hereafter into firmaments.

But what of the substance of these vapors? We confess that here are phenomena which, for the present, puzzle us. The analysis of the thin light of a nebula is a most difficult task, and we are but just beginning to succeed. Still, in these revelations are two words, and perhaps three, which we recognize. In the (planetary) nebula of Draco are bright lines, which correspond to nitrogen and hydrogen, and one which comes very near to barium.

It should be remarked, in conclusion, that the failure to identify any terrestrial substance in a celestial body is not conclusive proof against its existence; since, in the case of luminous bodies enveloped in luminous vapors, the luminosity of the vapor may be such that its emissive property exactly neutralizes its absorbent property, so that the spectrum shows neither the dark lines nor the bright lines characteristic of the vapor.

For the purpose of furnishing a convenient conspectus of the results attained from the spectroscopic analysis of a large range of luminous objects, we append to this article a table compiled from the leading authorities.

Such are the principal facts which the most recent studies in cosmical physics have revealed respecting the unity of the material universe. We cannot fail to be impressed by the validity of the conclusion, and the importance of the lesson which it teaches respecting the unity of that intelligence and power and personality of whose will all these phenomena are the objective expression and interpretation.

The phenomena which we have surveyed and reasoned about are all facts of co-existence. There is a co-ordinate view of unity in nature which presents *facts in an order of succession*, contemplating every phenomenon as a stage in a single devel-

else, that having gaseous envelopes like the ordinary stars, these envelopes are in just that state of luminosity and tension which renders their emissive power equal to their absorbent. Such a state of vaporous luminosity would, therefore, exceed that of our sun. (Compare Proctor: "Other Worlds than Ours," pp. 289–292.)

opmental line stretching backward and onward toward eternity. Such a survey is adapted to leave upon the mind an impression of the unity of the controlling Intelligence through boundless *time*, as vivid as the glimpse we have taken is fitted to impress respecting the unity of that Intelligence in boundless *space*. That survey, which is complementary to the present one, and which brings us into the presence of the question of cosmical evolutions, must be deferred to another occasion.

TABLE OF ELEMENTS RECOGNIZED IN THE HEAVENLY BODIES.

ELEMENTS.	DARK-LINE SPECTRA.							Dark & Bright line.	BRIGHT-LINE SPECTRA.			
	Sun[1]	White Stars. Secchi's first type.		Yellow Stars. Secchi's second type.		Variable Stars Secchi's third type.		Red[3] Stars. Secchi's fourth type.	Nebula in Draco.[4]	Envelope of Eta Argus.	Winnecke's[5] and Encke's[6] Comets.	Shooting Stars.[7]
		Sirius.	Vega.	Aldebaran.	Pollux	Betelguese.	[2] Pegasi.					
Sodium ...	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					*
Iron.....	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Hydrogen .	*	*		*					*	*		
Magnesium	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Barium ...	*						?		?			
Copper....	*											
Zinc.....	*											
Calcium...	*			*		*						
Chromium .	*											
Nickel	*											
Cobalt	*											
Strontium .	?											
Aluminium.	?[2]											
Cadmium..	?											
Silicon....	?[2]											
Potassium .	?											
Bismuth ..				*		*						
Tellurium .				*								
Antimony .				*								
Mercury ..				*								
Nitrogen ..									*			
Carbon ...								*			*	
Titanium ..	*											
Thallium ..						?						

[1] The *chromosphere* of the sun contains sodium, hydrogen, magnesium, and barium.
[2] Secchi: "Le Soleil."
[3] Secchi: "Le Soleil."
[4] Huggins: "Spectral Analysis of the Heavenly Bodies."
[5] Huggins: Phil. Trans., 1868. See also "Comte's rendus," lxvi, pp. 1299 and 1336.
[6] Young: "Amer. Jour. Sci.," [3] iii, p. 80.
[7] Alexander Herschel.

Art II.—CHRISTIAN PURITY.

The Nature and Blessedness of Christian Purity. By Rev. R. S. Foster. New York. 1851.

Christian Purity; or, The Heritage of Faith. Revised, Enlarged, and Adapted to Later Phases of the Subject. By Rev. R. S. Foster, D.D., LL.D. New York. 1869.

Max Muller, in his lectures on the "Science of Religion," has well said that "the intention of religion, wherever we meet it, is always holy. However imperfect, however childish a religion may be, it always places the human soul in the presence of God; and however imperfect or childish the conception of God may be, it always represents the highest ideal of perfection which the human soul for the time being can reach and grasp. It lifts the soul above the level of ordinary goodness, and produces at least a yearning after a higher and better life—a life in the sight of God." In like manner we conceive that the means which all religions employ are designed to secure the end which they contemplate, and to bring the soul into the possession of that for which it yearns. Hence, the erection of temples, the institution of priesthoods, the offering of sacrifices, as well as all the pilgrimages, ablutions, fastings, penances, mortifications, and prayers which they have enjoined, were for the purpose of enabling the soul to realize its own ideal of goodness and purity. It cannot be doubted that the consciousness of sin and guilt has burdened human hearts in all ages and in all climes. During all the centuries a bondaged world has been groaning for deliverance—crying out in its agony or despair, in one form or another, "What must we do to be saved?" Nor can we fail to notice that all these systems of religion, following only the light of nature, or the crude traditions which they have embodied, whatever the means which they have employed, whatever their intention may have been, have left the nations in disquiet and unrest, failing utterly to "make the comers thereunto perfect." The stream will not rise higher than the fountain; and no human soul will ever rise above the level of the god which it worships, or the ideal of the system of religion which it embraces. Hence, the history of the world demonstrates clearly that the various systems of heathenism

have only tended either to bestialize, to enslave, or to corrupt the nations.

It is right here, we claim, that the religion of the Bible infinitely transcends all other systems of religion. It presents before the mind a Being, not only of infinite wisdom and of boundless power, but one who is also possessed of absolute holiness and purity. It presents him as the model, after which all his intelligent creatures may be transformed. It makes us to hear his voice, speaking to us, and saying, "Be ye holy; for I, the Lord your God, am holy." And not only so: it reveals to us the vast remedial provisions which he has made for us in our lapsed and fallen condition, and gives utterance to the richest promises and assurances of both his ability and willingness to make us all that he requires us to be. It is these great truths which the volumes before us attempt to illustrate and enforce. About twenty years ago, the author gave his first volume on Christian Purity to the Church. What he then wrote, as he says in his preface to his revised and enlarged work on the same subject, was "under the inspiration, and conducted during the evolution, of an exalted experience, and amid the glow of intense zeal. The present writing," he says, "is the fruit of calm study, and mature and deliberate judgment." By a careful comparison of the two volumes, we are satisfied that the author's estimate of his work is correct and fair. At the same time, we cannot help feeling that if the "exalted experience" and "the intense zeal" under whose inspiration the first volume was written could have been combined with the "calm study and deliberate judgment" of his riper years and experience, it would have added greatly to the freshness and interest of the later volume. Yet it must be admitted that the present edition is a great improvement on the first, not only in its style, but, also, in the greater clearness and exactness of its statements, the completeness of its arguments, and the power of its appeals.

As might be supposed from the author's relations to the Church, and from his deep and often-expressed convictions, he writes from the purely Wesleyan stand-point—giving in every chapter great prominence to Mr. Wesley's teachings, and conforming his own utterances to them.

When we come to consider this question, to seek for light to

guide us to its proper solution, several important inquiries crowd upon our mind. We want to know, first, what the author means by Christian Purity; and then, as to whether it is possible to enjoy such a state or experience; and if so, whether it is not our duty to enjoy it at once, without any further delay; what is the way by which it may be enjoyed, whether by gradual processes, or by an instantaneous work wrought in us, following some crisis in our experience; and whether, when it is wrought, the soul is conscious of it, and may speak of it without hesitation or doubt. We find that all these, and kindred questions, are treated in these volumes with great clearness and forcefulness, and with that Christian candor and charity for which the author is distinguished. However the reader may differ from him on various points, he must admit that while he presses his argument with great force, and with all the strength of his vigorous intellect, he never so far forgets himself as to condescend to bitterness of spirit, or to the petty narrowness of partisan bigotry. These points must now pass somewhat rapidly in review before us.

What, then, does the author mean by Christian Purity? To give us, as he says, "the utmost explicitness" of definition, he disclaims several ideas which have been associated by some with this state. He does not include in it "infallibility of the intellectual processes or faculties;" nor "physical perfection;" nor "freedom from mistakes, or temptations to sin, and suggestions of evil;" nor "impeccability, or exemption from liability to sin, or freedom from sorrow;" nor "perfection of degree, or attainment beyond which there is no progress." But he does include in it: (1.) "A state in which the Christian is *entirely free from sin*, properly so called, both inward and outward; a state in which he will do no act involving guilt, in which he will possess no unholy temper, in which the entire outward man of the life, and the entire inward man of the heart, will be pure in the sight of God."—P. 72. (2.) "But, additionally, we include in our idea of entire holiness more than mere freedom from sin in the foregoing sense. That is merely a negative view; it has a positive character. We believe it to include, besides this, the spiritual graces, as love, meekness, humility, and such like, in perfection—perfection not of measure, but of kind. That these graces exist in the entirely

sanctified soul without alloy, without mixture, *in simplicity.*" —P. 76.

Thus we see that it is not claimed for any one that he has reached, or that he can reach, "angelical perfection," or "Adamic perfection;" but that a human, fallen, sinful being may be so saved, renewed, and sanctified as to be free from not only the condemnation and power of sin, but from its defilement and impurity; while those involuntary mental and physical conditions which arise from his lapsed and fallen state may still remain without invalidating or negativing the entire holiness of his heart and life. The various theories which have been held by different persons and at different periods are noticed by our author, but not for the purpose of combating them. He prefers rather to formulate the doctrine as held by the Methodist Church, and to proceed directly to its defense; knowing well that if this is substantiated, all other theories must fall to the ground. The position, then, which he assumes, and which he proceeds to defend, is as follows:

> That entire sanctification and regeneration are not identical; that regeneration is sanctification begun; that entire sanctification may be an immediate or instantaneous work, and is almost, if not always, a distinct one, to be attained by the agency of the Holy Spirit, through faith, at any time when the requisite faith is exercised, and once so attained is an experience to be enjoyed during life.

This, he proceeds to say, "in our deepest conviction contains the truth—*nothing but the truth*—THE ENTIRE TRUTH."

Throughout the entire discussion of this question Dr. (now Bishop) Foster uses the words holiness, purity, entire sanctification, perfection, and perfect love interchangeably, and as meaning the same thing when applied to this state. The use of the word "perfection" we may say, however, has given rise to much misapprehension and prejudice because of its ambiguity in our language. In its original use it signifies wholeness, completeness, adulthood. But in its ordinary use it signifies the possession of every excellence without frailty or fault. Hence, when any one speaks of perfection as attainable in this life, the minds of multitudes are shocked at the idea, and revolt from it as the height of fanaticism or folly. When the Old Testament speaks of Noah, Abraham, and others as perfect men, its undoubted meaning is that they were upright, sincere men, men of integ-

rity. In the New Testament the word evidently signifies *adulthood*, and refers to one who has attained "unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Such a one is a perfect *man;* that is, he has all the elements of spiritual manhood developed. He has outgrown the childhood and the young manhood of his experience, and come into a full-grown, vigorous, and complete manhood. We think that, understood in this sense, the word is divested of its ambiguity and repulsiveness, and the true idea which its use is intended to convey is seen to be in harmony with the teachings of the word of God and with the facts of Christian experience. But as the use of the word in an unmodified and unexplained sense is liable to do more harm to this question than good, we think that great care should be exercised in employing it in the discussion of this state. The other words referred to, especially when qualified by the word "entire," have a more fixed and definite meaning assigned to them, and are more readily and clearly understood. In addition to these the words, "higher life," "rest of faith," "full assurance of faith," and "full salvation," have generally come to be understood as signifying the same thing as the words holiness, purity, etc. Very much depends, in the use of these words, on the previous training of the persons employing them, and the peculiar phase of the religious experience which they enjoy. All these forms of expression are either directly, or substantially, employed by the inspired writers as indicative of this blessed experience, and none of them should be slighted or ignored. Many, doubtless, as President Edwards, Payson, and others, have enjoyed this rich experience who have never made use of any of the forms of expression referred to in the relation of their experience; but we can clearly gather from the language which they do employ, that they had entered into this Canaan-land and were feasting upon its rich and luscious fruits. The largest Christian charity should, we conceive, be exercised by those who write upon or speak of this experience, and especially by those who testify to its personal enjoyment.

We are now brought face to face with this inquiry, Is this state, or experience, to be attained and enjoyed in this life? This is *the* great question in this whole discussion. For if it *can* be, it *should* be; no excuse, then, of whatever kind, will avail for "neglect of this great salvation." If it cannot be, it is

useless to discuss the question further; we must wait until "mortality is swallowed up of life." Dr. Foster most clearly shows the distinction between regeneration and entire sanctification. The only wonder to our mind is, that there should ever have been any question on this point. The whole New Testament so clearly marks this distinction; the creeds of all evangelical Churches so fully express it, and the experience of the Christian world so abundantly demonstrates it, that any theory which would state their identity must be regarded as sentimental or fanciful. There are, therefore, only two prominent opinions in the Christian world on the question of the attainableness of the state of entire holiness. The one is, that it can be attained only at death; the other, that it may be enjoyed while the soul is still in union with the body, and amid all the temptations, afflictions, and activities of life. That it must be obtained *some time* and *some where*, all evangelical Christians agree in affirming. It is the latter opinion, referred to above, that our author most ably and eloquently argues and maintains. He shows most clearly that a holy God has commanded it; that we are exhorted to its enjoyment by holy and inspired men; that it is promised with the utmost clearness, and on almost every page of the Word of the Lord; that men who have prayed "in the Holy Ghost" have asked for its bestowment upon themselves and others, and that many of the Old and New Testament saints have enjoyed this grace. And he argues most logically and convincingly that, if God has commanded it, its attainment is possible, or else he is unjust; if God has promised it upon the performance of practicable conditions, then, when those conditions are complied with, the fulfillment of the promise will be realized or God is false; if holy men, under the inspiration of the Spirit, have prayed for it, then they believed it attainable, or, if not, they were guilty of mockery; and if they were not inspired by the Holy Ghost, then so much of the inspiration of the Scriptures is denied; or else they were led by the Spirit to ask for what it was before known by him that no man could receive. And, furthermore, if we are exhorted to this duty by inspired men, then it is practicable; or, if not, we are exhorted to make efforts to do or to be that which it is neither practicable for us to do or to be. Further, if Christ died to make provision for our entire purity, or holiness,

then his provision is adequate for this work or it is not; his blood can cleanse from all sin or it cannot. It follows, then, that if the provision is inadequate the atonement is a failure; if the blood of Christ cannot cleanse from all sin, then the remedy is insufficient. Such are the alternatives involved in the affirmation or denial of the attainableness of this state in *this life*. For all these commands, and provisions, and promises, and prayers, are for the present time and the present life.

There can be no doubt that some of the old pagan philosophy has, almost unconsciously, crept into the dogmatic theology of some of our creeds, by which sin is located solely in the flesh, and all evil is attributed to matter. If this were true, then the work of death might, in some sense, add to the means provided for the destruction of sin. But sin has its seat in the soul; and the fact that the soul is united to a body which labors under the involuntary effects of the fall, and which suffers, as a consequence, pain, sickness, and death, does not make it necessary for sin to remain in the soul until that connection is dissolved by death. If it did, then death is to be regarded as a factor in the work of our complete sanctification. But we all know that death is only a physical change, not affecting the character of the soul, but only changing its mode of existence. If it is the blood of Christ which is to effect this moral purity, that blood can cleanse the soul as well now as at any period in the endless cycles of the future. If it is the power of the Holy Ghost which is to sanctify the believer wholly, he can just as readily and effectively employ, or exert, that power now as at any time in the future. The Word of God recognizes no other agencies in this work than the blood of Christ and the power of the Holy Ghost. These agencies are regarded and announced as all-sufficient, and if they could fail, the whole Christian system would fail with them. We are aware that a certain school of divinity, in order to make this state of holiness more readily and easily attainable, has declared that the law of God has yielded its claims, and lowered itself to meet our actual condition. But whatever motive may have prompted the dogma, it has no foundation in the Word of God. We nowhere learn that the law of God relaxes its claims upon us, or that it makes any allowance for our lapsed condition. This is not the province of law. By it is simply the knowledge of sin. But

what the provision of infinite love is designed for is, to lift fallen man up to the required conditions of the law; and where, through involuntary weakness or infirmity, he fails to meet its requirements, to supplement his lack and cover his defects, so that in Christ he may stand complete. After a careful consideration of the objections which have been made against the present attainableness of this state, the author concludes the chapter devoted to them as follows:

> Reflect: Cannot you by the grace of God live one minute without sin? If a minute, can you not an hour? If an hour, a day? If a day, a year? You overlook the power of the grace of God. We are weak, and cannot too much distress ourselves; but "through Christ strengthening us" we are "able to do all things." Shall we limit "the Holy One of Israel?" Shall we plead in extenuation of our sins, our weakness, our inability, when Christ stands ready, waiting to enter the list for us? O! but you say, My difficulty is not *to live* without sin, so much as it is *to be* without sin. If I could once be set on my feet I might go, but I cannot get on my feet. "O wretched man that I am!" Have you ever heard of one whose name is Jesus? You may not be able to raise yourself, but have you tried him? Cannot he save? His name is Jesus—*Saviour*. Surely he has power, power now, power to save even you and me, and every man that will come to him; power "to save unto the uttermost."—Pp. 177, 178.

Now, then, this question of its attainableness being settled, it follows that it is the *duty* of every Christian to employ the means required to attain this state at once, and not to delay an instant in answering to the divine call and in measuring up to the divine requirement. If the mind, when convinced of its privilege, does not yield itself up to its convictions and proceed at once to secure that which is so freely provided and proffered, then it will stand condemned before the bar of its own conscience; that condemnation will be immediately announced in its consciousness, and the results will sooner or later exhibit themselves. A mist of prejudice, or a doubt, or unbelief will, ere long, vail this question before the soul; then, if there is continued indifference and neglect, that mist will increase to darkness, when he who doubted will deny, will scorn the doctrine, and sneer at those who bear their testimony to the experience of this grace; and in some instances it has doubtless been true—and it may be so again—that thus shunning the light of truth, and grieving the Spirit of God, some sad moral

catastrophe has occurred in the history of the mistaken one, until from the wreck and ruin of his character and hopes he has been led to cry for mercy on his soul. For if "the light" of truth, of the Spirit, "which is in you become darkness, *how great is that darkness!*" In the first chapter of his book the author declares that,

> Present possibility of holiness determines present duty of holiness. This is a form of good which, to the utmost extent possible, is obligatory. If we may forego other forms of good without guilt, we may not neglect this without fault.—P. 21.

Still more strongly he says in his appendix, in speaking of the retention of sin in the soul of the justified believer:

> Is he guilty? To a greater or less extent, Yes. He is kept constantly repenting, and ever needing pardon. His want is to have such an inflow of power as will restore God to his undisputed throne, and so will enable him to possess and preserve moral wholeness. It is his privilege to have this, and until he do, there is so far forth sin remaining in him. The sin may be in his want of strength, or in his act or want of action, as the guilty cause by which his weakness remains. The weakness is sin only as tending to sin; its retention is sin, as implying voluntary neglect to embrace proffered strength. Properly speaking, original depravity is not sin, but native tendency to sin. Its continued existence implies personal sin, forasmuch as grace is offered for its cure; and if cure be wanting, therefore it must be so because of personal neglect or malfeasance. *Any remaining depravity, therefore, is at the same time sin and the proof of sin, inasmuch as entire sanctification is proffered for its removal, and he voluntarily remains under its guilty sway.*—Pp. 326, 327.

The italics in this last sentence are our own. We have made them to call attention to the somewhat new and startling form of putting this question. We are well convinced that this scriptural and logical deduction has not been dwelt upon sufficiently by the advocates of this great doctrine, and that in its future presentation it should be more carefully and earnestly urged upon the attention of the Church. If it is admitted that it is the *privilege* of the Christian to be entirely holy, then the conclusion follows, irresistibly, *that it is his duty to be holy*. And it follows, further, that if he voluntarily neglects or refuses to avail himself of this privilege he is, just so far as he does so, responsible for his neglect or refusal.

By those who believe it to be both their privilege and duty

to attain or enjoy this state of entire holiness, two opinions are held as to the way of its attainment. The one class hold that it is a gradual work, going on from stage to stage, until finally all sin is excluded, and all the graces of the Spirit are matured and perfected; the other, that by a strong exercise of faith the soul may immediately enter into this state, be cleansed from all sin, and be wholly sanctified to God. Both of these opinions are based upon the fact of an actually existing state of justification and regeneration in the soul of the one who is seeking to enjoy entire sanctification. There can be no movement of the soul toward entire holiness until these great changes are wrought. We say these *great changes*, the one relative, the other real; for no tongue can tell, or language describe, the greatness of the work which has already been wrought for and in the true believer. No undervaluation of either of these changes will ever tend to advance the cause of entire holiness. To our own mind it seems that, when the sinner is justified and regenerated, the most difficult part of the work of his salvation has already been performed. The whole foundation has now been laid on the immutable rock of the sacrificial sufferings and death of Christ; while the throbbings of a new life, implanted by the Holy Ghost, are experienced in every part and power of the soul, and a divine strength is imparted, not only to overcome sin, but, also, to "build the gold and silver and precious stones" of a Christian character and life. But this experience, great and glorious as it is, is not entire holiness. Indeed, the mind of the sinner, when awakened by the Spirit of God to the consciousness of its sins, does not rise to the conception of, or desire for, entire holiness. The felt want experienced by him is that of forgiveness, of deliverance from the wrath of God, of a new heart. Hence his prayer is for these blessings, and his faith grasps them only. It follows that, according to his faith, so it is done unto him. He is justified, he is regenerated, and the sense of the divine displeasure is removed. It is right at this point where multitudes of Christians make a fearful, if not a fatal, mistake. They regard the work which has already been done for them as a terminal point, which they are to endeavor to hold, but beyond which no further progress is to be made. And some have taught that even this joyous experience cannot be maintained, but

that there must be a relapse into darkness, and doubts, and sin. As a consequence of this mistake, many never advance beyond that first experience of the grace of God; while many more speedily relapse into sin, and are brought under its condemnation and power. It is to be feared that, in consequence of defective teaching, or for the want of a proper conception of privilege or duty, multitudes in our evangelical Churches have no clear evidence of their justification before God. And it is this fact, more than any other, which causes so little struggle, or even desire, after entire holiness. There can be no doubt that, when the work of the divine Spirit has begun in the soul, it must go forward or decline and die. There is no stationary point in that work, no position which can be gained and held without either advancement or retrogradation.

But while these things are true of so large a portion of those professing to be Christians, there are others—and their number is too small—who go steadily forward from the moment of their conversion, "growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." And it is this class of persons who, more frequently than any others, feel the need of entire holiness, and make earnest efforts for its enjoyment. It must be admitted here that all such growth in grace is *growth toward holiness.* Every elevation which is gained, however slight it may be, brings the soul nearer to God and holiness. More than this: the Holy Spirit discovers to that soul more fully its remaining corruptions, and its consequent need of entire purity. Sooner or later this discovery will be made. The tendencies to evil and sin, the elements existing in the soul, antagonizing the new life and struggling for the mastery, will show themselves, and give rise to disquiet, dissatisfaction, and, sometimes, to doubt as to whether or not the work of conversion has been wrought. But the young Christian should be taught that the mere *existence* of these elements in his soul will not condemn him while they are kept in subjection, and that it is only when they are allowed to *triumph* over it that they bring it under the bondage of guilt and condemnation.

Our author thus clearly presents this state of the case:

> But at length a new occasion for disquiet arises. The purified spiritual vision discovers a great depth of iniquity within, and the quickened and tender conscience is convicted and pained by deep

inwrought pollution. Hence arises a godly sorrow, not as of condemnation and dread of God's wrath, but of self-abhorrence in view of the infinite purity of the divine nature.—P. 96.

Again:

The old rebel and usurping propensities are not cured; they are only chained. They are still alive and make war; they clamor, and sometimes, in moments of weakness, prevail. The new order is preserved by struggle.—P. 127.

While the Word of God clearly declares that many Christians are "yet carnal," and so are not "sanctified wholly," it is always difficult to define precisely what is that sin which remains in the soul after its justification and regeneration. While acknowledging the difficulties with which this question is environed, Dr. Foster grapples with them manfully, and endeavors to solve them satisfactorily. "Sin is *ἀνομία*," lawlessness. And this signifies that it may consist in the positive and willful violation of the law, or in the want of conformity to, or harmony with, the law. In the one instance it involves guilt and condemnation and eternal death; in the other it may exist without either guilt, or condemnation, or liability to eternal death. Now when one is justified by faith, all his willful violations of the law of God are freely and fully forgiven, and with that forgiveness the sense of guilt and condemnation is removed. "There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." But, while in the act of regeneration, which immediately follows that of justification, there is the implantation of a new life, there is not the removal of the depravity of the nature, of the tendency, the proneness to sin. On this question our author says:

Now if we understand the theology and philosophy of the subject, two distinct wants grow out of the terrible effects of sin. One is the need of pardon, the other is the need of healing or cure; and though they *may* be supplied simultaneously, as they are distinct they need not necessarily be. The relief of the one may be perfect at once, that of the other may be gradual or in stages. Not only may there be this difference, but there certainly is. Moreover, the wants themselves differ in kind: one excludes from God as of ill-desert, the other disqualifies for God, as of incapacity.—P. 122.

A recent writer on this subject says:

But in all the great and glorious things which are done in justification and regeneration, not a single inbred sinful tendency is

removed from the essence (?) of the soul. Every such tendency remains in the nature or essence of the soul after the great work of regeneration has been wrought. Name all the inbred sins catalogued by divines, or by inspiration, or by consciousness, and the consciousness of each reader will tell him that not one of these has been removed in regeneration. Do not pride, unbelief, aversion to holy duties, irreverence, envy, jealousy, anger, ambition, impatience, love of the world, selfishness, and an unwillingness to make sacrifices for the welfare of others, besides other forms of sin, all, without exception, remain in the soul after regeneration ?*

Now we hold that it is the complete removal of these "inbred sinful tendencies from the essence of the soul" which constitutes entire sanctification.†

The question now returns, Are these heart evils to be eradiated by gradual processes, or may they be entirely and instantaneously removed? No clearer answer, perhaps, was ever returned to this inquiry than that which was given by Mr. Wesley, and quoted by our author with favor:

> A man may be dying for some time, yet he does not, properly speaking, die till the instant the soul is separated from the body; and in that instant he lives the life of eternity. In like manner, he may be dying to sin for some time; yet he is not dead to sin till sin is separated from his soul, and in that instant he lives the full life of love.

Some persons do more rapidly and uniformly grow in grace than others, and their experience the sooner effloresces and ripens into perfect purity, albeit the soul may be scarcely conscious of the time when the work is accomplished—just as the morning star melts into the light of heaven, or aurora brightens into the bursting glories of the day. And it seems to us that the early and easy entrance of the soul into perfect purity will be more frequent in the future as this great truth is more clearly taught and more widely known. But, up to this period in the history of the Church, in most instances where this experience has been clearly realized it has been in some great crisis in the history of the believer. Sometimes it has been right in the midst of the ordinary routine of duty and experience, when the soul has been convinced of the desirableness and necessity of this great work, and without hesitancy or delay to "confer with flesh and blood," the consecration has been

* "Light on the Pathway of Holiness," by L. D. M'Cabe, D.D., pp. 36, 37.

† How then would apostasy be possible without another change in the essence or substance of the soul.—Ed.

made, the sprinkling blood has been applied, and the baptismal fires of the Holy Ghost have sealed the covenant. In other instances, months and years of struggle have intervened between the period of regeneration and that of entire sanctification. Then, again, "the hungry, longing, earnest soul, in the general attitude of trust, has been surprised by the sudden unction of the Holy One." *

All this is readily admitted. But then it is clear from the Word of God and undoubted testimony of thousands of Christians that this work may be wrought *instantaneously*—NOW. And if it may be, then it is our duty and our privilege to seek to have it done now. Thus eloquently does Dr. Foster write on this point:

> That the earliest possible attainment of the end is most desirable—is *duty*—we must believe. Three months were sufficient to bring Israel from Egypt into the promised Canaan. They were forty years on their journey. It was their sin that they were so many times sick, and weary, and foot-sore, and heart-sore, when they might have been over the Jordan, feasting on the grapes of Eshcol and the choicest fruits of Engedi; and, more yet, when they might have been driving out of their heritage the enemies of the Lord.—Pp. 188, 189.

Again:

> Entire holiness, not at death, not at the end of a long journey, not by slow growth, however possible it may be, and even certain; but entire holiness now, the privilege and duty of all believers, we must hold is the doctrine of God, and the doctrine which needs most to be urged upon the Church which is his bride.—P. 190.

The laws of growth in the natural world, which are referred to by the inspired writers, have been pressed by the advocates of the gradualistic theory to a meaning which does not legitimately belong to them. These laws are regular and fixed, and are so uniform that we can calculate with some degree of certainty when "the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear" will make their appearance. Not so with the laws of spiritual growth and development. These appear under a vast variety of forms, and have no fixed periods when we may calculate upon their completion. Some are always "laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward

* Dr. Steele in "Zion's Herald."

God;" others, again, who when for the time that they ought to be teachers, have need to be taught the first principles of the oracles of God, and have need of milk and not of strong meat. (Heb. v, 12.) Surely if the corn grew as slowly as many Christians do, starvation would stare the world in the face; and if children matured as slowly as some of the children in the Church, we should have a race of dwarfs and pigmies. And as the figure will not apply to all the processes of spiritual growth, much less will it apply to the fullness and endlessness of that growth. In nature, and in man's physical system, the blade comes to the full ear, and the child to a full manhood, and when these conditions are reached there is no further growth or development; but in the divine life, the perfection of grace in kind, and the attainment to spiritual manhood, are only the favored conditions for the soul's future and endless advancement in holiness, in love, and in joy.

In our further investigations of this subject we come to consider the means which we are to make use of in order to come to the enjoyment of this purity. God has but one ordained, unalterable, and essential condition affixed to his provisions and proffers, and that is *faith*. We are aware that this always presupposes and includes some previous conditions, or states, of mind which are essential to its existence and exercise. For instance, no man will believe in Christ for pardon and salvation unless he is first conscious of his sins and of his need of Christ, and is convinced of both his ability and willingness to save him. And so no man will believe in Christ for full salvation unless he feels his need of it, and is satisfied of the possibility of its enjoyment. If any one, therefore, would experience entire purity, there are several preliminary steps necessary before the crowning act of faith is exercised. There must be a conscious need of it; it must be definitely and specifically sought; there must be a full, complete, and everlasting consecration of our all to God, and a determination that, through grace, we *will* be holy. These steps having been taken, the soul is duly prepared to believe, and the act of faith will be comparatively easy. We wish to say right here, that many earnest Christians have often gone as far as this, and yet have failed because they have not taken the further and the final step of faith. They have come right to the borders of "the land of corn, and wine,

and oil," and yet they have hesitated to exercise faith in Christ —they have shrunk back from the promised possession, and have recommenced their wanderings in the desert land. Now had they at that time exercised what our author calls a "masterful faith," the waters would have divided before them, and they would speedily have entered into this rest. The struggles which many have spoken of in their efforts to obtain this spotless purity were not called forth in their efforts to believe, but in settling the preliminaries of faith. Faith may be, and often is, born amid the struggles and throes of the soul; but the moment of its birth ends the struggle, and peace and rest follow. Generally, these struggles arise in making the consecration of all to Christ. Many persons are unknowingly deceived here. They express their willingness to consecrate all to Christ, and even say they have really done so. But when, amid the clear light of eternal truth, and the illumination of the Holy Spirit, they come solemnly and seriously to do this work, as a preparation to receive entire sanctification, they will discover some darling idol, some cherished habit, which they will find themselves reluctant to give up, or even unwilling to yield. Here the human will opposes, or crosses, the divine. And just so long as it sustains this attitude, the soul will fail to enjoy the great salvation. But when the submission and the consecration are complete, faith can readily be exercised, and, believing, the soul is saved "to the uttermost."

Dr. Foster condemns, very justly, the language which has unfortunately been used by some persons, that "we are to believe the work is done and it will be done." This language is as unphilosophical as it is unbiblical. If a work *is* done, we have no need to believe that it will be done. And then, too, when a thing is done, it passes out from the region of faith and hope, and comes within the realm of consciousness. It is now no longer a matter of faith, but an experience in consciousness, which is knowledge. Again, we cannot believe that a thing is done unless it is really done, and then we *know* it. But if we believe it is done when it is not, then we believe what is not true, and so dishonor God and deceive ourselves. The sooner such language, therefore, falls into disuse the better, for it is calculated to mislead and injure precious souls.

Now, when this great work is done, may the soul be so con-

scious of it that it can unhesitatingly bear testimony to it? It seems to us that the inquiry, in part at least, suggests its own answer; for if the work be so great as we have seen it to be, then, certainly, it must announce itself to the consciousness, and the effects of it will be seen in the character and in the life of the one in whom it is wrought. The complete eradication of all the elements of evil from the soul, and the consequent existence of nothing in all its powers contrary to the graces of the Spirit, must be fully known to the purified believer. Not only so: it is evident that the same Spirit who accomplished this work within the believer will bear his testimony to the fact that it is done. All that the Holy Ghost accomplishes in the soul is known, with more or less of clearness, to the consciousness whether he convinces of sin, or renews the soul, or gives comfort, peace, and joy, or helps in prayer, or inspires, or sanctifies. All believe that this work of entire sanctification is the work of the Spirit of God. Now, then, if he is present in the soul performing this work, will he not announce his presence and his work to the consciousness? But how are we to discriminate between the witness of the Spirit in justification and his witness in entire sanctification? On this question our author speaks as follows:

> The difference of the Spirit's witness in the work of justification and entire sanctification is not in the manner so much as the thing which is witnessed *to*. It is the same Spirit; the phenomena are the same, but the testimony is to different facts, and consequently differs. When one is pardoned the testimony is to precisely that fact, that he is pardoned, made alive to God; but it is not that he is entirely sanctified. When he is entirely sanctified, the same Spirit bears witness again, just as he did before; but now it is to another fact, not that he is pardoned, but that he is entirely sanctified. And if the former change was known to his own consciousness, so also will this latter be. Thus the Spirit witnesses with our spirits to our religious state whatever it may be, whether of justification merely, or entire sanctification.—P. 230.

Where this inward witness is experienced, it will be fully corroborated by a holy life. If there is entire purity of heart, there will be entire purity of character and of life. Should any one profess to have received the witness of entire sanctification, and yet, at the same time, evidently lead an irregular or an unholy life, his profession would be vain; aye, more, it would work serious injury to the cause of God. Even the

young Christian has power over sin, and his outward life shows clearly the change which has been wrought in his soul. And as the experience of the sanctified believer is on a higher plane, so his life will be more blameless and holy. It is to the life that the Church and the world look for a confirmation of the testimony of the lips. Our own mental and moral states are only known to our consciousness. Others cannot lift the vail and penetrate this inner sanctuary of our being. The life is the only index to them of what is going on in the depths of the soul. The Lord Jesus clearly gives this as a test of our real character. It is by our "fruits" that we are known. Too much importance cannot be attached to this thought. We think that the ordinary standard of Christian living is fixed far too low by the Church—far below that which the Word of God has fixed. And it is this laxity in the lives of those who are professors of religion which so frequently hinders the progress of the cause of God, and is the fruitful source of most of the infidelity in the world. If, therefore, one should testify to having attained a higher Christian life, and yet should exhibit no deep consecration of life and no blameless obedience to the divine commands, his testimony would be vain and worthless. If it were necessary that there should be only one testimony, either that of the lips or that of the life, we would say, By all means let us have the testimony of the life. But both may be harmoniously blended, so that the one shall be sweetly confirmatory of the other. And yet no life on earth will, or can be, so pure and holy but that some will harshly criticise it, others will attempt its defamation, and others still will hate and persecute the one who lives it. And none will be more active in these things than professed religionists themselves. It was a pharisaical hierarchy which crucified the Lord Jesus Christ and stoned the saintly Stephen to death. More sneers and sarcasms to-day are flung at those who endeavor to live saintly lives, by those who are called Christians, than by the godless world around.

There are many restrained from seeking for this entire purity lest they should be unable to meet the responsibilities of this relation. But this difficulty is without any foundation in fact; for with this experience there comes a divine strength to enable its possessor to abide in this perfect love, by keep-

ing the commandments of the Lord. The great anxiety should be to obtain this salvation—to have this experience. When it is enjoyed, then there will be no difficulty in meeting its responsibilities and exhibiting its grace; but it is one of the saddest sights to see one trying to act this state without the inward grace and power. Where the light *is*, it will shine without any effort. All the soul has to do is to "let it shine." The sun, moon, and stars do not try to shine; they have the light, and—they shine.

There are *degrees* in this state of entire purity. When the soul has entered upon this experience it has every thing to learn; and while the fruits are perfect in kind, they are very far from being perfect in degree. Now that the believer is holy, he is to "perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord." The tests which the author applies to this state are, as he says, "severe;" but they are all met, in a good degree, in the infancy of this state, and are manifested more and more as the soul matures and strengthens in it. In the early stages of this grace, too, lapses are not only possible, but probable. Some unguarded word may be spoken—some sudden temptation may be yielded to—and, of course, the soul sinks down at once from its high position. Then comes the sad suggestion of the adversary, "It is utterly useless for you to try to be wholly the Lord's. See what you have said—see what you have done!" This suggestion should not be listened to for a moment, although many have listened to it and relapsed into their former mode of living. Now the unfortunate and unhappy one should come again to the fountain of Jesus' blood, and sink, by faith, deeper than ever into its crimson tide. Another point which Dr. Foster makes in this connection is worthy of attention. A person may lose the evidence of his entire purity, and still retain the evidence of his being in a justified state before God. Of course if he sins willfully and persistently, then he forfeits both his justification and sanctification; but what would mar, and even negative, this witness would not utterly destroy his peace with God.

If Christians, then, have this evidence of their entire holiness, they may, and they should, bear their testimony to its truth and reality. Duty, gratitude, honor, and moral honesty will compel them to this. Of course all "boasting is excluded"

from this testimony. In bearing it with meekness, simplicity, and fear, the purified believer has no idea or desire of exalting self, but of glorifying Christ. No doubt that much damage has been done to this cause by a hasty profession, and by unguarded and open-mouthed assertions; and yet the truly sanctified soul must testify of, must confess, Christ. If the heavenly light which the Holy Ghost has enkindled in his soul is put under a bushel, or under a bed, because of the fear of men, or from a desire to please men, or in view of the opprobrium to be met in making this confession, it will be not only concealed, but will be smothered and expire from mere exhaustion, in darkness. On this point Dr. Foster utters the following by way of caution to those who enjoy this grace: "Do not fall into the delusion that specific profession should be confidently and often repeated." For our own part we could wish that the word "profession" were never used in this connection. Although the words profession and confession have the same general signification, yet the former has come to have a fixed meaning as something boastful and egotistical. It is not, therefore, the primary meaning of the word to which we object, but because of the associations with which the mind surrounds it, especially when employed in connection with this experience. The word "confession" is generally understood in a subjective sense, and consequently is much less objectionable. And hence when he who has attained this grace bears his testimony to the fact, it is not a profession of what *he is*, so much as it is a confession of what *Christ has done for him*. Thus all semblance of egotism and boasting is excluded. The glory is all ascribed to Christ, to whom it properly and of right belongs. The *ego* is made to sink down into the dust of the lowest and deepest humiliation, WHILE CHRIST IS ALL IN ALL. Any thing which savors of a boastful profession is always offensive to sensible persons. It may startle and excite the wonder of the ignorant, gaping crowd for awhile; but the intelligent and the thoughtful will either listen to it with pain or with disgust. Every thing connected with this state excludes boasting. If the believer has been cleansed from all sin, it is the blood of Christ which has cleansed him. If he is sanctified wholly, it is only by the power and presence of the Holy Ghost that this work has been wrought. If Christ

is made to him "sanctification" as well as "wisdom and righteousness," "let him that glorieth, glory in the Lord." If he is to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh him a reason of the hope that is in him," he is to do it "with meekness and fear." Thus, while "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, with the mouth confession is to be made unto salvation." Two very important cautions, among many others, are given by Dr. Foster at this point: the one is, that we are not to profess to enjoy this blessing as a *means* to its enjoyment, (p. 216;) and the other is, that such a profession will not *repair* any suspicion which the person himself or others may have, that he has lost this grace. (P. 306.) Certainly to profess to enjoy what one does not enjoy, in order to enjoy the thing which is professed, is not only an absurdity which no sane person could indulge in, but is a downright falsehood which no Christian would be guilty of. And to profess to enjoy a grace which has been manifestly lost is equally absurd and false. Such a profession might deceive men, but it cannot deceive God; and instead of bringing the soul nearer to God, it would land it in deeper darkness and doubt.

With regard to the utility of "special meetings" for the promotion of Christian holiness, Dr. Foster has some very timely remarks which we cordially indorse. As to the reasons which have mainly led to the holding of these meetings he says: "We cannot doubt that in many, perhaps in most, instances they have been driven to separate and class-effort from the indifference and coldness of their brethren, and in many instances of the pastors."—P. 276.

What he says about "schools," and "class-religion," and segregation of the body of believers, we cordially sympathize with. Such persons as "are forming into a separate body, acquiring a nomenclature of their own, having a charmed circle within whose inclosure only certain persons are expected to be found, calling themselves by the names of favorite leaders, and becoming known to and specially sympathetic with each other," (p. 275,) certainly are not pursuing either the wisest or the best course. We suppose that the Doctor is here specially aiming at the Nazarite and kindred movements, the excesses and vagaries of which greatly damaged a large district of our

Church, and are justly deserving of all the condemnation fulminated against them; but all the meetings for the promotion of holiness which it has ever been our privilege to attend have been widely different from those described above. Those whom we have met in these meetings have been, as a rule, among the most loyal and devoted members of the several Churches to which they have belonged, without the remotest idea of separating from them. The nomenclature usually employed has been thoroughly biblical or Wesleyan. We have never known one to be called by the name of any favorite leader, and we have never been taught any sign or grip by which they become known to each other. That those who attend these meetings are specially interested in this great question is readily admitted. That the subject of holiness is the burden of the thought, the desire, the experience, the instructions, and the testimony, is what might reasonably be expected; and the circle where they meet is only a "charmed" one because of the manifest presence of Jesus. Holiness never divides. It is the everlasting bond of union which binds man to God and saints to each other. It is sin which sunders this bond, and brings disorder, division, and disorganization in the universe. Hence the eternal antagonism between these two elements. And wherever sin reigns or remains, unless there be the most earnest desires and efforts for its removal or destruction, and in just so far as it exists or dominates in the soul, there will be antagonism to holiness and holy persons. Holiness is the great unifying power in the Church of God, and in proportion as it is cherished and cultivated will the Church be united and prosperous.

We are hopeful, therefore, that the mighty movement which has been going on, not only in our own beloved Church, but also in our sister Churches for several years past, for the revivescence of this doctrine and experience—a movement now so well understood, and having so generally the approval of the leading minds of the Church—will bring back all our ministers and people to our normal *status* on this question, and land them upon a higher platform of Christian experience and efficiency.

We cordially indorse what Dr. Foster says about the unity of the Church in all its grades of experience: "Christians are all one family; and though some have attained more grace,

deeper experience, than others, the family circle should not be sundered."—P. 277.

It is true that some of the family are only babes in knowledge and experience; but they are to be all the more loved and cared for because they are babes. The weak, the feeble, the halting, and the faint, need all the more encouragement and aid. Some may and will think and act differently from others; they may occupy different stand-points; but they are neither to be slighted nor ignored because of these things. The "strong" in the family ought "to bear the infirmities of the weak." And more than this: not only should this love and care be extended to the members of our own branch of the family, but also to *all* the branches of the family of God. Here is a plane of Christian experience which is elevated far above the narrow lines of denominationalism, the petty jealousies and envies, the contentions and strifes of parties; and where Christians of all creeds and of all forms of worship, "who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," are united in the inseverable bonds of love.

In presenting the motives for the attainment of entire holiness, the distinguished powers of our author are more fully brought to bear than in any other part of his book. He calls our attention to a "ceaselessly preaching universe," while he analyzes its utterances as it speaks of the "intrinsic excellence and glory of this state," of "the command of God," of "the interests of the cause of Christ in the world," of "our surroundings," of "time and eternity," of "heaven and hell." On these last motives he speaks as follows:

> Would you see the value of holiness, linger here. Pursue the upward destiny of a soul brightening under the smile of God forever. See its ever-increasing and unfolding beauty; hear the ravishing melody of its triumphant song. The ages flee away; but mightier than decay, stronger than death, the soul lives on, ascending, widening its circle, becoming more and more like God, and losing itself ever in his ineffable radiance. Such is the destiny of a soul washed in the blood of Jesus. Behold, on the other hand, a soul darkening under the frown of Jehovah. Ages fly away; its darkness broods darker still, its sorrows gather down in denser folds; it is lost. The lengthened periods of eternity roll by, but they bring no redemption; deep, dark, dismal gloom settles around its sphere forever. Learn by the contrast the value of holiness. Its presence is life; its absence is eternal death.—P. 323.

We are truly thankful that this great doctrine has been so clearly and ably presented. God is calling upon his people now to be holy as at no former period in the history of the Church. Never before was this privilege so clearly and extensively proclaimed. Never were there so many living witnesses of its experience. Never were there so many of our ministers and people really "groaning after perfect love." Nor is this work confined to our own Church. Episcopalians and Quakers, Presbyterians and Baptists—in a word, representatives of all the evangelical Churches—are beholding their calling, and beginning to "apprehend" more fully "that for which they are apprehended by Christ Jesus." And this mighty movement is characterized by the absence of all controversy, and by the high and increasing valuation which is placed upon *testimony*. While it is essential that the doctrine should be clearly formulated and simplified, yet it would be nothing but a dead letter if it were not vivified by a blessed experience and enforced by the saintly lives of those who profess to enjoy it. And it is this "word of their testimony" by which the saints of God are to overcome this world—testimony based upon experience, and corroborated by a holy, blameless life. If the whole Church were coming up to this experience, if all its ministry and membership had graven on their hearts and on their lives "Holiness unto the Lord," how soon would this redeemed world bow down at the feet of Jesus! Recognizing her obligations, she would employ her energies for this purpose. Acknowledging her stewardship, she would lay her wealth upon the altar of sacrifice; and what is now expended for luxuries, trifles, and extravagances, or hoarded up in the spirit of covetousness, would become holy unto the Lord, and would be employed for the world's redemption. Not only so: she would also gladly give up her sons and daughters to bear her messages of salvation to the ends of the earth. Then the strongholds of heathenism, infidelity, Romanism, intemperance, impurity, and error would fall before her victorious arms, while, comprehending her possibilities, and reaching forth to experience and enjoy them, she would confess, illustrate, and exemplify that entire Christian purity which is the inheritance of the saints.

Art. III.—THE LAND OF THE VEDA.

The Land of the Veda: Being Personal Reminiscences of India; Its People, Castes, Thugs, and Fakirs; its Religions, Mythology, Principal Monuments, Palaces, and Mausoleums: together with the Incidents of the Great Sepoy Rebellion, and its Results to Christianity and Civilization. With a Map of India, and Forty-two Illustrations. Also, Statistical Tables of Christian Missions, and a Glossary of Indian Terms used in this Work and in Missionary Correspondence. By Rev. William Butler, D.D. Third Edition. Royal 8vo. Pp. 550.

It was at the very beginning of the second millennium of the Christian era that Mahmoud of Ghuznee, that fierce and intolerant iconoclast, poured down from the highlands of Central Asia his Tartar hordes upon the teeming plains of Hindustán, marking by his sanguinary crescentades the eleventh century far more deeply in the pagan East than any event, whether of martial prowess or religious propagandism, marked that era in the Christian West. The first faint streaks of morning light had not yet appeared above the European horizon, shrouded in mediæval darkness; from the Bosporus west, and north from the Pillars of Hercules, the whole continent was wrapped in an almost starless night. Peter the Hermit and his motley following of crusaders had not yet made their first march for the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher, and the songs of the troubadours were yet unsung. Mahmoud and his followers did more to stir the stagnant pool of Hindoo life—the religious life of India—than the aggregated efforts of the whole world of Christendom were at that time accomplishing in awaking and arousing moribund Europe from the deep lethargy in which it lay during those centuries of intellectual, moral, and religious gloom. In doing this they laid the foundations of a new empire—the most splendid known in the annals of the gorgeous Orient—upon the ruins of more than a hundred kingdoms, principalities, and states, the rulers of some of which might have traced their kingly descent back beyond the days of David and Solomon.

Not only did Mahmoud and his chieftains, during their twelve principal incursions—made ostensibly in the interests of religion, but resulting in bringing to the raiders treasures of untold wealth—prepare the way for, and even inaugurate, the upbuilding of the magnificent Mogul empire, but, while propagating the faith of Islam among the timid and yielding

Hindus—teaching the Koran in the land of the Veda, until to-day, at the sound of the muezzin's call to prayer, more than thirty million followers of the prophet turn their faces westward from the plains of India toward the Kaaba in Mecca—they also became the unconscious founders of the Urdu tongue, a language now spoken more or less fluently by perhaps a hundred millions of people in the great Gangetic valley and the provinces of Northern India, and in which the traveler may make himself understood from the Himálayas and Peshawar on the north to Calcutta and Cape Comorin on the south.

The story of these invasions is clearly seen to mark a new era in the history of India; in fact, it marks the very beginning of all succinct and reliable history concerning that great South Asian peninsula and its babbling millions. Just there its trustworthy written chronicles begin, and the anxious historian is able to separate between the dubious past and the surer and more trustworthy records of subsequent chroniclers. Beyond that all is hopelessly mixed and blended with the uncertain, extravagant, and improbable. As a race or sect the Hindus possess very few, if any, really authentic records of their country and the vast peoples who have from time to time inhabited it. In this the Buddhists, who for a time occupied nearly the whole peninsula, far surpassed them, as these have left something from which to weave a partial history of their advances and successes, and of their final defeat and overthrow by the Brahmans of India.

It may be that the wide and fertile domain of mythology, giving free range to fancy, offered a more pleasing and attractive field to the glowing oriental mind than the cold and circumscribed one of matter-of-fact history. It is hardly possible that the extravagant imagination which revels in the creations of gods and demons, genii and giants, and in clothing them with fantastic powers to perform supernatural acts, should take delight in the sober details of historical facts. Certain it is that the Hindu is rich in a literature detailing with marvelous minuteness the history of his gods and goddesses, the powers and operations of the heavens above and of the hells beneath; but any connected history of the real events happening on his native soil will be sought in vain. Kingdoms and dynasties have passed away without one faithful chronicler. Empires

have been lost and won without a single record of their fate. We know that vast and important changes have taken place, but are left to conjecture their causes. Historic fact is so blended with fantastic myth as to render both alike worthless. Human agents are so confused with demons and preterhuman beings, and their acts so inextricably intermingled, as to render hopeless the task of gleaning even a sheaf of fact amid a whole field of fancy. Coins, sculptured monuments, inscriptions on pillars and rocks, in caves and cave temples, the legends of the people and the genealogies of bards—these constitute the sources whence the history of India covering long ages must be drawn. But these sources, though tedious and imperfect, are yielding to the patient and scholarly efforts of western *savants* —numismatists, archæologists, and comparative philologists—a rich and increasing harvest of historic data, from which certain theories of more recent date are receiving confirmation, and others of long standing are being overthrown and discarded as now untenable or worthless.

To this sweeping assertion of the poverty of historical data in India, an exception might be urged in behalf of a catalogue of the Solar and Lunar races of kings, so-called, because they claimed descent, the former from the sun and the latter from the moon. Their rule in certain provinces of Hindustán reaches back to a date anterior to that of the Macedonian invasion. But this list of names, when any thing else than a mere list, becomes a "loose legendry of licensed fiction," and gives little idea of the reigns of these Hindu kings or the condition of the people under them. Far more of historic value and interest has been gathered from certain inscriptions on rocks and pillars, now generally ascribed to the era of Asoka, a powerful emperor who is supposed to have reigned toward the close of the third century before Christ, and to have extended his dominions to the most distant provinces of India, as these sculptured monuments, covered with records in the ancient Pali character, have been found in all parts of the peninsula, in Cuttack on the eastern coast, in the mountains of Gujerat on the west, and in the interior of the North-western provinces.

A theory has been advanced that much of the history of India which might have reached down to the present time is not forthcoming because of the great Buddhistic awakening

or reformation, which, from its outbreak early in the second century before Christ, swept over nearly the entire peninsula, and, winning its victorious way for eight centuries, humbled proud Brahmanism for a time, but afterward declined, until now it is only known in some of the remoter parts of the country. The Brahmans would fain conceal this humiliating record, and among their written works no clear statement of their overthrow as the spiritual guides of the country is to be found. But the monuments of Buddhism reveal a history that cannot be mistaken. What the Brahmans dared not commit even to the keeping of the palmyra leaf, the Buddhists committed to material structures, colossal images, the walls of temples excavated in the solid rock, as those at Ellora, Ajunta, and Elephanta, and, after the lapse of more than two thousand years, they now fill up in some measure a blank in the past history of India.

The record of the rise and fall of this great power in India, largely influencing, as it did, the destinies of the country and its people for more than twelve centuries, is a record of extraordinary interest even in the imperfect form in which we find it. For the historian, the philanthropist, the Christian philosopher, and the earnest missionary worker in the India field, there are interesting and important lessons to be learned from the glimpses which we get into the past mysterious history of that land through the huge rents made by the "violent hand of sectarianism," whether the sectary be the simple-minded, confiding follower of Shakiya Muni, the reputed father and founder of Buddhism, the red-handed propagator of Moslemism under Mahmoud and Tamerlane, or the disciple of Guru Nánuk, the great Sikh reformer of more recent times. By what strange power did the first-named of these faiths build for itself, in the very face of the Brahman priesthood, a social, religious, and political superstructure to last for a dozen centuries, and then wane in that land only to betake itself to even more populous China? What were its sources of strength in religious propagandism? Not the sword, for its founder, though of royal birth, was a saint, a recluse, who after years of asceticism only emerged from his retreat to lecture in the vulgar tongue among the common people, and in the very presence of kings, against the oppressions of caste and a hereditary priesthood. Denying the existence of divinity, he permitted

divine honors to be paid to himself, and pretended both to work miracles and to be himself a standing miracle of divine knowledge. If the history we have gathered be at all worthy of acceptance, then in the eye of the world the preachers of the Buddhistic faith counted manifold more genuine adherents in three or four centuries than all the ministers and missionaries of the Christian faith could count after the first seventeen centuries of their evangelizing efforts. Have we still a lesson to learn from these Buddhist priests? Their faith, though by no means a pure or rational one, was a vast improvement on the corrupt and cankering hierarchy of Brahmanism, and its advocates had to encounter much the same opposition which the Christian missionary has to meet from Hinduism to-day. The venerable Dr. Wilson, of Bombay, one of the oldest and most learned missionaries of India, in a very able and erudite article on this subject in a recent number of "The British and Foreign Evangelical Review," sums up what appear to him the palpable reasons for the wonderful success of Buddhism in India thus: "To the reaction which it produced against caste, and its accordance of a religious and civil *status* independent of that partial and tyrannical system, to its moral and ethical teachings, to its institution of predicatory missions, operating among all classes of the community and using the vernacular languages, and to its wonderful structural and excavated shrines and hermitages, are to be attributed its remarkable progress and triumph."

It may be well here to correct a very common error, one which prevails extensively in the United States, at least, regarding the prevalence of Buddhism and the number of its adherents at the present time in peninsular India. The writer has not unfrequently caused undisguised surprise by stating that during a residence of many years in that country he never made the acquaintance of a single follower of Shakiya Muni, either priest or pilgrim, except a few Jains or heterodox Buddhists who are still found in the Rajpootana States in Central and North-western India. When, therefore, the name of Buddhist is used, it should be understood that the orthodox adherents of this faith are rarely found on the continent, that is, in peninsular India, but in Burmah, and eastward in Farther India, and on the island of Ceylon; and that the great mass

of those professing this faith, perhaps the four fifths, are now found in the different provinces of China.

Any attempt to bring in a popular form the past history and present social, political, and religious condition of so old, so interesting, so extensive and densely populated a country before the minds of the people of the West, and especially of the Churches of America, must be deemed, as it has been pronounced, most praiseworthy. The author of "The Land of the Veda" undertakes no less a task than to lead us through and acquaint us with a country where, as we have already seen, the three great rival religions of Christianity in the world, to wit, Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Moslemism, have displayed themselves in their strength, the first and last still having their strongholds there—only Taoism and Sintooism remaining to complete the list of *all* the great opposing systems of faith which Christianity has encountered, and with which it has still to contend. How well this design has been accomplished the press and the public have already declared, and we propose still further to show. Or, if more substantial evidence be desired, the worthy publishers can testify by telling the number and size of the editions already exhausted in meeting the public appreciation of the work, although it is now only a few months since the book was issued and put into the market.

Few volumes have gone out from the great Methodist publishing house which have been more creditable as works of art than this beautiful volume, "The Land of the Veda." The cheaper editions are quite up to the best style of the "art preservative" in America, and the presentation volumes are in nothing short of superb. The engravings, with a few exceptions, are well executed, and greatly enhance the interest and beauty of the work. It might be expected that these would necessarily increase the price, as they certainly add greatly to the expense of publication; but the cost is in keeping with what it was the design of the author to prepare, namely, a *popular* volume on India; and in the consummation of this design we have no doubt both publishers and author will have ample reason to rejoice together.

In America—the new West—where as yet there are comparatively few large libraries, and these seldom containing more than a very few volumes concerning the old East, it is not sur-

prising that there should be a want of information and interest regarding India, and that the impression should be common that few books about that country had ever been written. While this want of information and interest is admitted only to be lamented, the common impression as to the paucity of works on the East is very erroneous. The catalogue of books written and now extant on India is exceedingly voluminous. If one will take the pains to look over the long list of works in the British Museum Library, and in the library of the late Honorable East India Company, as well as in other public and private English libraries, not to mention the many large and learned volumes published on the continent, and in India itself, within the last century, he will find that in many branches of letters, as history, biography, ethnology, botany, natural history, philology, numismatology, etc., a far more extensive literature exists pertaining to India alone than is generally supposed to be extant concerning the entire East, and comparing favorably with all the books ever written about the United States of America. When the author of "The Land of the Veda" was asked why he had chosen this novel and somewhat peculiar title for his book, he frankly confessed that, along with other reasons, the fact that nearly every available title had been already appropriated, and many of them several times, had led to this choice. The thousands of volumes already written and named had exhausted the list of titles, and a new one had to be chosen. It is, perhaps, not the best title that could have been selected, being liable to a charge of indefiniteness, taking in too much or too little, as more or less perfectly understood, and requiring consequent explanation. A less weighty objection is, that it is liable to almost uniform mispronunciation; the proper sound of the *e* in Veda being the continental, or that of our long *a*, and the final vowel (*a*) not being sounded at all. The pundits and people of India pronounce it *Vade*, to rhyme with our word *made;* but it may be too much to expect that American readers will stop to take lessons of Hindu pundits and munshees in orthoepy. The work, unless read in the light of its secondary and subsidiary title, namely, "Personal Reminiscences of India," is certainly open to criticism on the score of defective or imperfect arrangement. One could wish the second had been the principal title; the

philosophic and orderly reader would not then have felt the somewhat severe mental jolting occasioned by sudden and unexpected changes of subject, from narrative to historic fact, and again to descriptive detail, concerning the country, its people, their manners, religions, castes, etc., as may be found on pages 16, 76, 100, 206, and elsewhere. The matter of the entire volume might be much more artistically arranged without very great labor, and certainly without injuring the plan and integrity of the work, and, we think, without affecting the author's desire of furnishing a popular book. All that precedes the middle of page 16 should be made in form, what it is in fact, an introduction to the volume. Many of the chapters should be divided, and, while the narrative is kept up, the weightier and more instructive matter thrown into better shape.

The writer, in point of material, evidently encountered an *embarras du richesse;* and the difficulty, as is clearly apparent, arises from an attempt to compress in one volume the subject-matter of two distinct works, to wit: 1, The author's reminiscences of Indian life, including a vivid sketch of the great Sepoy Rebellion, and a brief glance at the founding of the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India; and, 2, A history of India, its people, their customs, literature, religions, castes, mythology, mausoleums, monuments, palaces, etc., including the author's observations and experience in connection with the civil and political occupancy of the country, with a statement of the progress of Christian missions, their past difficulties and successes, and their present *status*, including those elaborate and richly-laden tables of statistics at the close of the work. This would have given the reading public *two* fair-sized volumes of far more than ordinary worth. And nearly sufficient matter for these volumes, in befitting garb and of absorbing interest, the author has furnished in the work under review. In prosecuting the plan here suggested, much more space might be given to a history of the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India, of which Dr. Butler was the founder, and for eight years the energetic superintendent. Dissatisfaction has been expressed that, aside from a somewhat detailed account of the *founding* of these missions, and brief reference to the Orphanages and Zenana work, but little appears in these five hundred and fifty generous pages in relation to the

real work now in hand in that rich field, except as the *results* may be gathered from the closely printed tables in the appendix. Now that pastors and people, throughout all the borders of our Church, are seeking for reliable information, for facts and figures, concerning the actual operations and progress of our foreign missions, a volume for which there would be, for which there is now, great demand, might be written, merely taking up the work where Dr. Butler has laid it down.

Our missionaries in the great India field have now been hard at work for a period of thirteen years, during which time an average of twelve to sixteen men have been actively engaged; and to-day all the methods of aggressive evangelizing agency approved in modern missionary work are there in active and successful operation. The statistics, as tabulated by Dr. Butler, show a most encouraging result for the first decade of effective missionary labor; particularly when it is remembered that the first years of every such evangelistic enterprise must necessarily be years of toil, years of seed-sowing, with perhaps little apparent result. While this is true of the inception of any great undertaking, it is especially true of the planting of Christian missions in heathen soil; the time and energy of the workers being largely occupied in the acquisition of languages, securing sites, and erecting the necessary buildings for residences, schools, and chapels. Perhaps no mission to the heathen world has ever been more vigorously worked than our own in India, and the result is just what good and wise men might anticipate—gratifying success under gracious guidance, and an immediate outlook upon still greater achievements and still higher success. The Church, in its ministry and laity, desires to be made acquainted with the steps in our mission progress, and to be assured, as they follow the details of the work, that they are not deceived as to the efforts, trials, and successes of the workers.

High praise has already been bestowed upon "The Land of the Veda" by both the secular and religious press, alike in the unsectarian daily and weekly journal, and monthly magazine, and in the stately quarterly of almost every denomination, by ministers and missionary secretaries, travelers, and statesmen. One * says of it:

* Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, D.D.

"The Land of the Veda" has not been published one day too soon. It gives an insight into the social condition, religious and missionary history of a land which has been the scene of so much past injustice at the hands of Christian nations, and which is now attracting, among all branches of the Church, so much true enthusiasm and endeavor, that all classes of community are anxious to know somewhat more definitely and directly about it. The plan of the work is well adapted both to stimulate and gratify this curiosity. It is a most timely and comprehensive contribution to the history of Christian, and so of human, progress in these last days.

Another * says:

The beautiful volume entitled "The Land of the Veda" gives the best view I have seen of India in the great crisis of the Sepoy Rebellion, one that is highly instructive and interesting. The intelligent reader will see reason to believe that the rebellion was the natural result of causes that are gradually ceasing to exist, and that, in God's wonder-working providence, it put forward greatly the evangelization of India. The elaborate statements in many parts of the volume throw much light on what remains to be done in that remarkable country.

A third † says:

India is truly the land of wonders, and no one in recent times has better described and illustrated these wonders than has Dr. Butler. His word-painting is admirable, and to the illustration of scenes thus depicted he has here also brought to his help the power of the photographer and the engraver's art. . . . The volume is a most valuable contribution to the literature of India, and has special interest to us as coming directly from our own mission field in that great country.

These, and added pages of testimonials from other able pens, touching as above the various salient points in the book, and yet not all alike discriminating, show the reception the work has met at the hands of an appreciative press and public.

As a statistician Dr. Butler has probably no superior in the Church or in the country; in collecting, arranging, and tabulating facts and figures, showing the past progress and present *status* of evangelism throughout the world—at home as well as in heathen lands—he has more than once shown his ability. The common reader has no proper conception of the care and labor necessary to the collection and compilation of ten such

* Rev. Dr. Anderson, Missionary Secretary A. B. C. F. M.

† Rev. Dr. (now Bishop) I. W. Wiley.

tables as are found on pages 528 to 538 of this book, and may be hardly ready to accept the statement that these ten cost the author almost as much time and pains as all the other five hundred and forty pages of the work. A voluminous correspondence with the secretaries of the various Missionary, Tract, and Bible Societies in America and England, and on the Continent —indeed, not only throughout all Protestant Christendom, but with the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church as well— was necessary to bring together the mass of statistical information contained in these ruled and figured pages. Here is the skeleton, and to some the very meat and marrow, of many a missionary speech or sermon. It would take too much space to give here an analysis of and comment upon these tables. They supply very much in the way of information needed by those earnest workers who labor to make the "Missionary Sabbath" and the "Monthly Concert of Prayer" at once interesting and profitable. For example: the first table presents an encouraging view of the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India; the number of missionaries, native agency, Church membership, baptisms, day and Sunday-schools, and amount and value of property. Numbers IX and X of these tables, giving the statistics of Roman Catholic missions, and comparing the success of Roman and Protestant missions throughout the world, are full of wonderful statements, showing the marvelous success of the latter, despite the apathy of doubters and the opposition of the world, during their comparatively brief history, and exposing the exaggerated claims of prosperity on the part of the former. It is not surprising that Romanism has winced under the galling effect of these statistics, got from their own authorities by Dr. Butler; and that some of her champions have attempted a reply in the public prints, with but poor success. The figures they cannot deny, but the results they would fain keep from sight. Protestant missions have been only about seventy years in operation, while Roman missions are the growth of over three hundred and fifty years; and yet the former are accomplishing, as shown, fourfold more for the evangelization of the world than the latter, with all their boasted superiority of method and devotion of life. Let the statistics be examined, and Protestantism need not fear the decree.

The view taken by the author of the system of religion contained in the Vedas, though the popular one, is perhaps not the most just and discriminating. There exist at the present day, among the more advanced thinkers—oriental scholars, the statesmen and missionaries of India—two distinct and very dissimilar estimates of the sacred writings of the Hindoos. Perhaps we cannot better set forth the essential difference in the opinions held concerning the Vedas by different minds than by quoting a few sentences out of many at hand, representing the views of each side, and let the reader see how widely they diverge.

> The worship of Almighty God in his unity is taught in the Vedas. They contain a pure system of theism. . . . The religion of the Vedas is simple and childlike, but none the less pure on that account. . . . They teach good doctrine, and there is much in them that is not only beautiful, but that is Christian experience.

> No worship ever mocked the skies more miserable and contemptible than the religion of the Vedas. One is shocked at every step with the revelations of this mystery of iniquity and sensuality, where saints and gods, male and female, hold high orgies amid the fumes of intoxicating liquor, with their singing and screaming, and the challenging by which they urge one another on to deeper debasement, until at length decency retires and leaves them glorying in their shame.

There is no mistaking the disparity of view here expressed. Both seem to us extreme, and we possibly should take a middle course; but having noticed that he who through fear cries "*in medio tutissimus*," rarely fails to be the extremest of the trio, we prefer believing that the poor fellow who had lost his right hand and one or two fingers from the left, would be abundantly able to count upon the remaining digits all the western scholars who are now, or have been, able to give a fair and impartial estimate of the teachings of the Vedas. While we would not be counted among the apologists of the bad theology, false philosophy, and debasing immorality found mingled in these most ancient writings, yet we are safe in saying that we may do them an injustice unless we remember that, unlike the Christian Scriptures, they were not watched and guarded by the sleepless eye of opposing sects, and that they have not

come down to our times pure and genuine as are our Scriptures, but that they have been tampered with, interpolated and annotated, until it is now difficult to tell, except by the "analogy of faith," which is Veda and which Brahmana or annotation. There is in these ancient volumes of the Hindoo faith much that is true and beautiful and good, as well as much that is low, senseless, and bad. Whence came the former? and how and when were the corruptions introduced?

Dr. Butler has taken the more commonly received Christian view, namely, that of our second extract, being the same as that of Professor H. H. Wilson, and other eminent orientalists. Professor Max Müller, though not the safest champion of any cause, has said much in favor of the view given in the first extract, and has done more than any other man, except perhaps Rajah Rammohum Roy, to set these writings before the world in a more favorable light. Possibly the strictest orthodoxy will not be ready to forgive the learned professor for writing and sending forth his late work on the "Science of Comparative Religion;" and yet it may not be the wisest for evangelical Christendom, because it possesses all the truth requisite to salvation, to look with supercilious or intolerant eye upon all the teachings found in other systems. There *may* be much of truth, much that is good, much that is divine, in the Vedas, as well as in the Mahommedan Koran, and in the sacred books of other religions, though that truth may be sadly distorted and inextricably mingled with errors of man's devising. There is a question of great interest very closely related to this subject, which is as yet quite undecided, and which during the next decade or two will, we prophesy, be more extensively discussed than the question of the origin either of man or of evil. It may be stated thus: Has there been, during the history of our race, more than one center of manifest divine revelation? In other words, has God touched the human race, so as to communicate a revelation of his will at any point other than among the Hebrew people, and, after Christ, among his followers? or has he confided to the keeping of other races and languages the truths of his moral kingdom—especially a knowledge of the plan of salvation? Have any of the heathen nations been made the receptacles of a revelation in any definite form, even though less clear and specific, as other nations seemed to fall

below the Hebrew patriarchs and prophets in their fitness to receive such revealings? So much of truth, and even of high moral teaching, is found among certain peoples, that we must conclude, with the intuitional deists, (as the Brahmos, or adherents of the Brahmo Samáj,) either that God reveals himself to each intelligent being, or that these peoples have by contact with other nations, or through the agency of missionaries in the very earliest ages, received many of the truths of our Bible, or that a revelation has been made to them direct as nations and peoples. When this interesting question shall have been settled, if that time comes before the millennium, it may throw much light upon the composition and precise character of the Hindu Scriptures; meantime they must be used to throw what light they may upon the question.

As a matter of interest, and for the twofold purpose of showing, as we have stated, that very much of the true, the beautiful, and the good, may be found in the early writings of the Hindus, and also that a very near approach to the Christian scheme of redemption is easily traced in them, we here introduce a selection from the Rámáyan of Valmíki, the sage, written, in the Sanscrit language, long ages before the incarnation of Christ, and which is to-day read and rehearsed by hundreds and thousands of educated Hindus, in the hearing of the unlettered, by day and by night, so that the sound of the reading or rehearsal never ceases. This must of necessity exert a wonderful influence upon the lives of the people; and to the truth and virtue taught in it, and in kindred poems, we are inclined to attribute many of the noble traits and peculiar virtues of these people. The Rámáyan is probably the most ancient epic poem now extant, and is only exceeded by the Vedas in antiquity. It contains the history of the seventh incarnation of the god Vishnu, in the person of Rám, king of Ayodhya (Oude.) "The style and language of the poem are those of an early heroic age, and there are signs of its having been popular at least three centuries before Christ." In Mrs. Spier's "Life in Ancient India" we find the following brief argument of the opening chapter:

The island of Ceylon had fallen under the dominion of a prince named Rávan, who was a demon of such power that, by dint of penance, he had extorted from the god Brahma a promise that no

immortal should destroy him. Such a promise was as relentless as the Greek Fates, from which Jove himself could not escape, and Rávan, now deeming himself invulnerable, gave up asceticism, and tyrannized over the whole of southern India. At length even the gods in heaven were distressed at the destruction of holiness and the oppression of virtue consequent upon his tyrannies, and they called a council in the mansion of Brahmá to consider how the earth could be relieved of such a fiend. To this council came the god Vishnu, riding on an eagle, like the sun on a cloud; the other gods entreat him to give his aid, and he promises to be *born* on earth, and to accomplish the destruction of the terrific Rávan, the embodiment of evil:

Thus to the Lord by whom the worlds were made,
The gods of heaven in full assembly prayed:
"O, Brahma, mighty by thy tendered grace!
Fierce Rávan, leader of the giant race,
Torments the gods, too feeble to withstand
The ceaseless fury of his heavy hand.
From thee, well pleased, he gained in days of old
That saving gift by which he waxes bold;
And we, obedient to that high behest,
Bear all his outrage, patient and opprest.

He scourges—impious fiend!—earth, hell, and sky,
And Indra,* lord of gods, would fain defy.
Mad with thy boon, he vexes in his rage
Fiend, angel, seraph, Brahman, saint, and sage.
From him the sun restrains his wonted glow,
Nor dares the wind upon his face to blow;
And ocean, necklaced with the wandering wave,
Stills the wild waters till they cease to rave.
O Father, lend us thine avenging aid,
And slay this fiend, for we are sore afraid."

They ceased. Then pondering in his secret mind,
"One way," he said, "to stay this scourge I find:
Once, at his prayer, I swore his life to guard
From god and angel, fiend and heavenly bard;
But the proud giant, in o'erweening scorn,
Recked not of mortal foe, of *woman born.*
Man, only *man*, this hideous pest may stay;
None else may take his charméd life away."

When Brahma's speech the gods and sages heard,
Their fainting souls with hope reviving stirred
Then crowned with glory like a mighty flame,
Lord Vishnu † timely to the council came:

* The Hindu Jove or Jupiter; the regent of the visible heavens and of the inferior divinities.

† The *second person* of the Hindoo *Trimurti*, or Trinity; the *Preserver.*

Shell, mace, and discus in his hands he bore,
And royal raiment, tinged with gold, he wore.
Hailed by the gods, most glorious to behold,
With shining armlets forged of burnisht gold,
He rode his eagle through the reverent crowd,
Like the sun borne upon some darksome cloud.
Lost in deep thought, he stood by Brahma's side,
While all the immortals praised his name, and cried:

"O Vishnu, Lord divine, thine aid we crave,
Friend of the worlds, a ruined world to save.
Divide thy godhead, Lord, and for the sake
Of gods and men, *man's nature on* THEE *take!*
Shrined in the bodies of four* children, spring
From the three wives of fair Ayodhya's king: †
High rank with saints that godly prince may claim,
And those sweet queens, with Beauty, Grace, and Fame.
Assume man's nature thus, and slay in fight
This common scourge, who laughs at heavenly might—
The giant Rávan, who in senseless pride,
Has, trusting to his own right arm, defied
The hosts of Heaven, and ever plagues with woe,
Seraphs and gods above and men below.
Crushed are the blest, who roam through Nandan's‡ shade,
The saint, the seraph, and the heavenly maid.
We, with the sages, Lord, to thee draw nigh,
And crave thy succor that the fiend may die.
Angel and chorister before thee bow;
Our only hope, O conquering Lord, art thou.
Arise, O king, regard the world below,
And slay in fight the gods' tremendous foe."

Thus prayed the children of the sky; the Lord
Supreme of gods, by all the world adored,
Thus to the suppliants in answer spake:
"Fear not, ye sons of heaven, but comfort take;
Rávan, your terror, by this hand shall fall,
With son and grandson, lord and captain; all
His friends and counselors, his kith and kin,
Shall share his ruin as they share his sin.
Dwelling as man among the sons of men,
Thus will I triumph o'er the foe, and then
The while ten thousand seasons roll away,
Will guard the earth with mine imperial sway."

Then nymph and angel, and the minstrel throng
With heavenly voices raised the choral song,

---

* (Qu.: *one* "of four?)"
† Dasarath, King of Ayodhya, or Oude, father of Rám.
‡ The Celestial gardens of Indra; Elysium.

And all the region, filled with music, rang
With lauds to Madhu's * victor, while they sang:
"Go forth and fight and strike the monster dead,
The scourge of saints, immortal Indra's dread,
The fell fiend Rávan, raveñer abhorred,
Slay him and all his race, avenging Lord!
Then turn triumphant to thy home on high,
And reign forever in the ransomed sky."

Is it not evident that the writer of the above, no matter when or where or how, had attained to some knowledge of parts at least of the Christian or certainly of the Hebrew Scriptures? It seems hardly possible that without *some* intimation, received in some way, from some source, so clear a parallel to the plan of redemption, wrought out by Christ, could have been seen by any uninspired heathen writer. And if this knowledge was present to the mind of Valmíki, or those from whom he compiled, whence and how came it there? This is the question, and we leave it for others, or for another and more appropriate place than this paper.

If there be a bottomless abyss this side the bottomless abyss, it surely must be Hindu metaphysics, especially as applied to matters of religion; and the system by which it is elaborated is so far removed from that of the inductive philosophy, which, with us, has achieved such wonderful results in the domain of psychology, that the western mind is baffled in its attempt to grapple with that in which the educated oriental mind seems to revel and delight. It *may* be that just that portion which we utterly fail to comprehend is the most finely wrought part of their system, and that thus we do the teachers of Hindu philosophy severe injustice. But this we doubt. The difficulty lies rather in their intermingling and confounding things which the canons of Sir William Hamilton and other western teachers declare must be kept separate and distinct. For a time we move on smoothly, then suddenly sink beyond our depth. The Vedas teach the simplicity and rationalistic unity of the Divine Being: that he not only dwells in light, but *is* light; that he is eternal, self-existent, immutable, perfect, incomprehensible, omniscient, infinitely happy, and the sustainer of all things. Vyas, the author or compiler of the Vedas, asserts that the Supreme Being is the material as well

* A demon slain by Vishnu.

as the efficient cause of the universe; and, by way of illustration, shows that the human hair and nails, which are insensible, grow from a sensible animal body; and again, that sentient vermin, as scorpions, centipedes, etc., spring from inanimate sources, ordure, filth, etc. "The sea is one, and not other than its waters, yet waves, spray, drops, and froth differ from each other. So Brahm." The first cause of all is Brahm; he is represented as inhabiting his own eternity, or, in figurative language—since the coiled serpent is the emblem of eternity—as resting on this emblem. Brahmá is represented as first of created beings, and as springing immediately from the navel or center of the deity. The raw materials of the creation are supposed to be drawn out just as the spider's web is drawn out from itself. Man consists of three parts: one, spirit, which is included in two cases or bodies. The spirit of man is immaterial, and is an essential part of the Supreme Being. The corporeal part of man consists of two bodies—the material gross body, consisting of flesh, blood, bones, etc., and the sublimated body, the counterpart in every thing of the gross, and the vehicle of the spirit when the body dies. By it the consciousness of identity is preserved, and the person recognized after death as before. If the spirit attains to absorption in Brahm, or becomes immured in vile flesh, (as of the lower animals,) this body is supposed to vanish, otherwise it is immortal.

The same authority as above teaches strange doctrines in physics. When nourishment is received into the corporeal frame, it undergoes a threefold distribution, according to its fineness or coarseness; corn, and other terrene food becomes *flesh*, but the coarse particles are rejected, and the fine nourishes the *mind*. Water is converted into *blood*, the coarser particles are rejected, as urine, etc., the firmer support the *breath*. Oil, etc., becomes *marrow;* the coarser portion is deposited as bone, and the finer supplies the faculty of *speech*. A hundred and one arteries issue from the heart, one of which passes to the crown of the head. It is along this artery that the liberated soul, whose proper abode is the heart, makes its escape. From the crown of the head it passes along a sunbeam, through various regions to the sun; thence it proceeds to the moon, *far beyond* the sun. If it is to be rewarded with

absorption, it advances from the moon to the region of lightning, far beyond the moon, thence onward to the region of water, for lightning and thunder are beneath the rain-cloud and aqueous region. At length it arrives at the mansion of Indra. But if the soul has not merited final absorption, it must stop short, subject to transmigration at one or other of the intermediate regions, usually that of the moon; there, clothed with an aqueous form, it receives the recompense of its works, and thence retires to occupy a new body with resulting influence from its former deeds. The returning soul quits its watery frame in the lunar orb, and passes successively through ether, air, vapor, mist, and cloud, into rain, and thus finds its way into a vegetating plant, and thence through the medium of nourishment into an animal embryo!

Let Huxley, Darwin, and others take heart; they are in company with worthy ancients in their recondite researches. But we have wandered from "The Land of the Veda" into the Vedas themselves. Books so ancient and wonderful, having had such an influence in shaping the destiny of so many millions of our race, who for thousands of years have received them as divine, cannot be lightly thrown aside, but should be questioned as to how the good that is in them got there, and condemned only for the bad that so largely abounds.

We note briefly here a few among many points of interest, some of which would give ample scope, not for a brief article only, but for a volume.

Hinduism, or Brahmanism, is not, as commonly supposed, a unit. Under this title there exist two great religious systems, each divided and subdivided almost indefinitely. One, polytheistic and idolatrous, existing for many long ages among the great masses of the people; the other, monotheistic, professed by numbers of the thinking classes, and running through all the gradations between the opposite extremes of spiritual and materialistic pantheism. It is the latter system that has in its later developments so charmed the *liberal* Christianity of the present day—one of whose exponents, after years of unsuccessful missionary labor in trying to teach the Hindoos of Calcutta how their ancient faith is received and preached in Boston, recently became so enamored of the doctrines in their purity, as taught in

the land of the Vedas and Shasters, that he even presented himself for membership in the Brahmo Samáj, and was rudely snubbed for his temerity by his would-be brethren, with Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, the present chief apostle of that faith, at their head, they refusing him the hand of Brahmo fellowship! This is pitiful. Baboo Keshub, Miss Carpenter, Mr. Dall, and more especially their sympathizers among the liberal Christian clergy of England and Boston, who fondly imagine that they have got down through the uncertain drift of the Old and New Testament records, to what they call "rock bottom," may find, sooner or later, that it is not solid rock at all that is beneath them, but a species of crumbling stone, like brimstone. But the Brahmo Samáj, its members and admirers—Intuitional Deists they call themselves in India, on this side, Liberal Christians—a mere handful, even if we include all in Europe, Asia, and America—have already received extended notice in these pages, and we will only say here that we have less confidence in the leaders, less hope in good being or to be done, and a stronger conviction that pride and ambition are at the bottom of this revival, than many who have written about it. The whole movement may be so overruled as to work mightily for the evangelization of India, but if so, it will not be with the sanction and aid of its present leaders and promoters. Many of these are direct or indirect products of missionary effort, and now they turn around and assume a patronizing air toward Christianity, and superciliously speak of the missionaries who taught them and their fathers as "good, but mistaken men." Although convinced of the truth of Christianity, and having carefully observed that it is the only religion upon the face of the earth with the elements of constant and ultimate success inherent in it, yet refusing to become identified with it, and take their place among the rank and file of Christ's militant millions—lest by so doing they become mere unnoticed ciphers—they prefer to put themselves at the head of a small company, or church, in which enough of the truths and doctrines of the Bible shall be accepted to make their cause powerful for propagandism, and omitting just enough to show the world that it is not Christianity *pur et simple*, namely, the divinity of Christ and a written revelation. And what an omission! With the amount of light they possess, and the good teaching

and example they have had and still have, they may, sooner or later, become identified with the Christian Church; but the testimony of missionaries shows that it is harder to-day for one of them to take this step than for the man just waked from the death stupor of old Hinduism and idolatry.

We are glad the author presents his view, which is, without doubt, the correct one, of the much-misunderstood act of "blowing men from guns." Americans had almost made out a case against the British Government for allowing this "refinement of cruelty," as it was called. Yet it was not cruel; it was not commonly practiced, being the act of only one or two officers, and they were severely censured in the leading English prints at the time. We believe these officers were justified in thus sending terror into the hearts of those who were contemplating like horrid cruelties with those at Cawnpore and Delhi, and guilty of like perfidy. We do not know whether those who have more recently, during the past year, blown mutinous Sepoys from the guns, had the same ground of justification or not. We fear not, and hope not. The whole matter and manner of this strange mode of punishment are little understood, at least in this country. Dr. Butler sets it in the right light. He says:

Who will wonder that the men who stood around the door of the house of massacre, (in Cawnpore, where, by the order of the demon, Nana Sahib, over two hundred Christian women and children—the beautiful and refined wives and children of British officers—were in one hour cruelly put to the sword, or their dead and dying bodies dragged forth and thrown into the well outside,) and gazed upon a sight that no other men had ever seen, and who, as they reflected on all they had themselves so vainly endured to save those whose gory mementoes lay before them, causing those sun-burned soldiers to sob and weep like children; that such soldiers, in such circumstances, should have vowed vengeance against the perpetrators of this matchless cruelty.

Concerning the mode of punishment he says:

I have met with strange assertions, some assuming that the Sepoys were actually *rammed into* the guns, and then fired out! The mode usually was to sink a stake in the ground, and tie the man to it; the gun was behind him, from six to eight feet distant, loaded with *blank cartridge*, and when discharged it dissipated his remains. It was a quick and painless mode of death, for the man was annihilated, as it were, ere he knew that he was struck.

But what the Sepoys objected to in it was the dishonor done to the body, its integrity being destroyed, so that the *shraad*—or funeral ceremony, which all caste Hindus invest with the highest significance, as essential to their having a happy transmigration—could not be performed for them; and thus their disembodied ghosts would, in their opinion, be destined to a wandering, indefinite condition in the other world, a thing which they regard as dreadful.

This mode of punishment was introduced into India by the French during their brief rule in the south. And it certainly had the effect desired during the mutiny year in the northwest. From the hour when General Corbett inflicted it upon twelve ringleaders, who had risen one night and shot their officers, till the fall of Delhi, not a single Sepoy hand was raised against an officer's life.

Dr. Butler's personal reminiscences of the Sepoy rebellion of 1857, and his strange experiences, sad but successful, in founding the missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in North India, making up as they do a large portion of the book, are chapters of intensest interest, and read like the pages of a finished romance. The sad story of Cawnpore, and the relief of Lucknow by that gallant Christian knight, Sir Henry Havelock, will never lose their interest while the English language is spoken, or while travelers from all parts of the world visit these shrines, made sacred only a few years ago by such a wealth of human agony.

This splendid volume touches upon too many topics of interest to every intelligent reader to admit of a thorough review in an article of ordinary length. Ministers and laymen must secure and read it for themselves. It is being widely read, and has already done more than any other work to stir up an interest in missions, especially those connected with India. The beautiful map of Hindustan given, so small as to be easily consulted, and not cumbrous, with every inch of its surface brimful of statistics, is the best on such a scale ever issued, and is a real help to the study of that great peninsula. Our mission field, with all its central stations, is clearly marked, the extensive railway lines are given, and the different provinces and states neatly colored. The glossary of Indian words, used in this work and in missionary correspondence, is a most desirable addition. It might, perhaps, be somewhat extended,

and a few errors corrected, and for the benefit of those who wish to pronounce the words correctly, a key to the sounds and accents given. We think the author has used Hindustani words in many places throughout the text where they would be better omitted. To the later editions a complete index of all matters touched upon in the work has been added. In future editions we would suggest the correction of frequent clerical, typographical, and other errors, that the work may be a model in every respect.

We had purposed quoting some of Dr. Butler's eloquent passages, such as those found on the twelfth and thirteenth pages and elsewhere, but space forbids. His introduction is a masterpiece of fine writing, and there are many pages throughout the book showing a most facile use of the English language. But the composite character of parts of the work is shown by an unevenness in style, which sometimes falls very far below what it is at its best. We had also designed to refer to the Russian question, and show how missionaries generally do not fear or believe that India is so soon to be in the clutches of the great northern bear, and to give their reasons for thus believing. Then there is that wonderful myth, which has come so opportunely to the aid of many a sermon, of "Jessie Brown" and her "Dinna ye hear the slogan?" a little romance written, Dr. Butler tells us, by a French governess for the amusement of her pupils, finding its way into the Paris and then the English papers, until it has gone around the world. It seems a pity it was not true then and there at Lucknow. Dion Bourcicault and his talented wife have made money out of it, and the world probably will go on believing it, though "the heroine and incident are alike fictitious!"

After reading the "Land of the Veda," many will doubtless not only be awakened and aroused to a genuine missionary enthusiasm to give and labor and pray for the perishing myriads of India's sons and daughters, but some will want to go there. May many more workers rise up and ask to be sent! And now that one may "put a girdle 'round the earth," if not in "forty seconds," yet in a few weeks or months, and as India is being belted from end to end with railways, a stream of travel is setting in in that direction. Every day during the cold season, from October until March, parties of English

and Americans may be seen visiting the sites of memorable events in that strange oriental land—the ruined Residency at Lucknow, the beautiful Memorial Well at Cawnpore, the peerless Taj Mahal at Agra, the wonderful Kootub Minar at Delhi, the highest minaret in the world; tombs and temples, mosques and mausoleums, rock-cut cave temples and ancient ruins, such as India alone can display. Besides this, her oriental pomp and magnificence, her beautiful scenery of tropic and temperate zone, her strange peoples, her grandest mountains, broad and mighty rivers, fertile valleys, populous cities, and all hoary as the Vedas with age. Pity it is that the nine tenths of all these travelers are mere sight-seers or health-seekers, and take hardly sufficient interest in the millions of the lands through which they pass to even call upon the missionary, ask him how his work prospers, and bid him God-speed. Too many prefer to get their impressions of missionary labor and success from godless consuls, merchants, and ship captains, who neither know nor care to know whether the religion of Christ or Mohammed, the faith of Brahman or Buddhist prevails. But we close with the closing thought of Dr. Butler—that the strength and progress of the Church of Christ in India to-day are in encouraging contrast with the weakness and obstructions of the ante-rebellion days:

> Already some of our native Christians are rising to positions of great responsibility in the Church, the State, and learned professions. The Maharajah Duleep Singh, its first royal convert, illustrates how its higher classes shall bow to Christ, and devote their influence and wealth to his glory; while Government officers like Behari Lal Singh, and Deputy Magistrates, like Tarini Churn Mitter, prove how worthily public positions can be filled by the followers of that faith. And their descendants shall yet occupy every office of their Government in the glad day when their Ganges shall flow only through Christian realms, and their fertile lands shall be cultured by a happy Christian population, whose redeemed country, no longer the LAND OF THE VEDA, "shall be called by a NEW NAME, which the mouth of the Lord shall name."

Art. IV.—MEDIATION.

According to Holy Scripture this world was made by and for the Son of God. Speaking of him under the designation of the Word, St. John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." This is confirmed by St. Paul, who says, (Col. i, 16,) that "By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him." That is, all things were formed through the unincarnated Son, "whom," it is further stated, (Heb. i, 1,) "God hath appointed heir of all things, and by whom he made the worlds." These statements, by fair interpretation, are to the effect that this world, and the universe, too, so far as we know, were constituted the theater on which the scheme of redemption was to be acted.

From these it is to be deduced, also, that this world was not made for plants nor animals, nor for any thing less than man. Man was the grand archetypal thought of God in the creation; and all processes, and growths, and developments, and preparations upon this earth prior to the coming of man upon it, were but growths and preparations for man as the highest, grandest result of God's work in the creation; for man is a constituted intellect and soul and personality vastly above all other grades of being in this world. He is a free personality, capable, through his freedom, of acts praiseworthy or blameworthy, and thus only capable of making his own happiness or misery. And this capability links him to God and to God's government, and renders this world to him but the beginning of his existence—a border-land merely to another world. An inborn sense of responsibility correlates him to a moral world which in scope is unlimited and in duration never-ending. Perfectly free in the use of his capability and responsibility, he is started in being here with the power to remain holy and happy forever, but with the certainty, as God sees it, that he will not, and thus has God acted with a view to that certainty and provided for it. Thus has He created

all things by and for the Son of God; and the very fact of this relation of the Son to the creation is evidence, nay, proof, that the worlds were made for mediatorial purposes. If we follow out this thought progressively we shall have occasion to touch upon the need, the method, and some of the successive stages, of Christ's mediatorial work.

As to its necessity, let it be repeated that this world was made for man. All creations and conditions prior to man have their head, their culminating result, in man. Arriving at man in the creative process, conscious personality first appears; and in this personality appears for the first the capacity of free, objective, independent feeling, judging, and thinking—the likeness to God, in other words, and the only connectional moral link with him which up to this time has come into view. When brought on the stage he stands the representative of the race, the master of the realm of nature, and the arbiter of his own destiny. In his free moral activities are freighted the destinies and the whole possible physical spiritual resources of the world formed to his hand and committed to his keeping. Free-will was the grandest treasure committed to him; but this he abused, and made himself an outcast—out of harmony with God, and in a state of guilt and misery. He fell from being man as originally intended and made; that is, from dominion within himself of a free and consciously pure spirit to that of gross selfishness and animalism. He became at once subject to suffering and death. To these he would have been a stranger *forever*, doubtless, had he not fallen. Possibly no changes would have occurred in his case except those of ever-advancing growth and progress in the heavenly life. Death itself, most likely, would not have been experienced. In place of death a glorified transfer only might have taken place. It is not a proof against this that death should necessarily be a human lot, on the ground that inferior creatures were subject to it, because man was placed at the head of the creation, the godlike regent of every thing and every creature below him to be ministered unto by them: they serving thus the chief object and the sole end of their creation. His *status* was the exaltation of his whole triune nature—spirit, soul, and body—into the life of heaven. But whether or not he had been parted from earth, his natural

home was heaven, and unbroken communion with God was his normal, natural experience.

On the other hand, the position, use, and destiny of the lower creatures were wholly of the earth, with no relations higher. They served the purpose intended for them, then gave place to successors of their kind. Death to them was scarcely an evil; it seems rather a beneficent law for them. Suffering and evil cannot in any proper sense be predicated of their condition, because self-consciousness and associated ideas are out of account with the brute creation. Their sensations are moment by moment only, and the dullness or acuteness of sensation with them is proportioned to the grade of their organization.

But man precipitated himself from his high exaltation, and descended quite near to a brotherhood with the brute. Only partial remains are to be found in him of the image of God, the lofty godlike attitude in which he was made. Enough *is* left to give to him a sure consciousness of guilt, and of misery consequent upon guilt. When a being like man, made thus exalted and for such heaven-high purposes, falls, may we not suppose the shock of his fall is felt through the whole kingdom of nature? Is it unreasonable to suppose that the shadow of his misfortune and guilt is cast upon all creatures below him? His guilt, of course, cannot be transferred to them to share; but the anarchy of his character, somehow, gives a wrench to the order and peace of nature, and they surely seem to feel the jar and the disturbance. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." "All the foundations of the earth are out of course." This is more than metaphor. A basis of fact underlies such statements, and it is safe to affirm a significance corresponding to a symbolic cry of sympathy on man's behalf in the sad tones and aspects of nature, animate and inanimate. God utters in them a great natural prophecy of a purposed redemption. He invested man with all the possibilities of an everlasting integrity; but he foresaw that, tampered with by a superior foreign force, man would fail of his integrity, and he provided for exigencies that must follow.

There is foolhardiness in setting up human wisdom against mysteries that hover over these deep subjects. God's thoughts

and plans are not like man's, characterized by successiveness and limitation. Counsels and plans within his spaceless being and timeless eternity are the sweep of one infinite conception, and cover, incomprehensively to us, all possible relations, conditions, exigencies, and acts outside of himself, at a glance. Thus did he, from his own infinitude and eternity, take in, as an ever-present view, the relations, conditions, exigencies, and acts which should transpire with man whom He made through his Son by the word of his infinite will.

Thus much touching the necessity of a divine mediatorial scheme, and it suggests, next in order, an inquiry as to the method of the divine working in the case of man. Wherefore made He the worlds through the Son of God? Let us not be restrained by the unfathomable mysteries pertaining to God in this question. The question involves the *how*, as well as the *why*—which latter has in part been already noticed—and we are compelled at once to waive the seeming metaphysical impossibility of any method existing at all in an absolute Deity. Absoluteness is out of the question. Creation had been impossible if there be no mode of existence in the essence of Deity other than that of absoluteness. God has made beings to whom he stands related; and when he steps forth from the darkness which conceals him and is about to reveal himself in any aspect or fact of his nature, he takes care to prepare minds with notions and presentiments as his forerunners. He has constituted the human soul with felt limitations and wants and unanswered expectations with a precise adjustment to receive announcements and revelations in due time, and to embrace them without surprise or questioning. For example, the suggestion of a trinal personality in Deity as a method of being and action could probably never have originated in the human mind; but when in the Bible the term wisdom is spoken, as in Prov. viii, 1, or the term word, as in the prophets frequently, and more especially in John i, 1, there are to be found stirring in some minds certain presentient ideas of self-appointed or necessary distinctions in the Divine nature which for want of a better name are called personal distinctions. But these were intimations merely, preparing for the reception of the full revelation in due time. That revelation began in Jesus Christ. In himself he was a clear revelation of God to the world, and

when he had risen and spoke to his disciples of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they asked for no explanations of these mysterious personal distinctions; they found in them a mode of access to God; their presentient wants were met; and they went their way rejoicing, ready at the proper time for still further mighty revelations.

The doctrine of the Trinity, however, solves a difficulty as to the mode in which God exists, and as to the method in which he works, in respect to a mediatorial scheme. The mystery here is not for scholars and philosophers to pry into—the fact announced is a revelation to be received with implicit, child-like trust. A thousand mysteries besides are easily admitted to faith by us simply because they must be. So this mystery must be received, for without it Christianity cannot be comprehended. We certainly do profess our faith in the Trinity when we formulate to our belief the whole ongoing drama of redemption. There is in this, throughout, the demanding by the Father, the performing by the Son, and the appropriating by the Spirit what the Father demands and the Son effects. By a divine method like this our poor weak natures apprehend and come unto God. He could never have been revealed to us, so far as the facts now known can assure us, but for the going forth of the eternal distinctions in his nature of Father, Son, and Spirit. In his absoluteness he must have forever been concealed. He could not have become a Creator; there could not have been any object out of himself to be related to and to love.

The method of creation by the Son, therefore, was a necessity of the divine nature. By the Son, also, every method of procedure in the grand scheme was necessarily mediatorial. A Deity absolute and consequently impersonal, entirely unrelated to distinctions within himself and to creatures outside of himself, with no eternally existing arrangement in himself to put forth power, wisdom, and goodness, is a very forbidding if not an impossible conception, and we cannot trust in it. On the other hand, instead of such an impersonal, metaphysical Being, we do have what seems the clearest revelation of practical, personal distinctions in the Godhead, so answering the preformed, craving sentiments of our nature that we rest in that revelation with supreme satisfaction. Only from hence can we

obtain satisfactory aid to our notions of a competent mediatorship. The nature of sin and the infinite Being whose law is outraged by sin being duly considered, the demand for only a finite mediator to propitiate for us is utterly inadequate. From considerations just named nothing less than a mediator infinite and eternal can satisfy any mind that is heathful, comprehensive, and clear on this subject. And God has met the need of such minds by revealing that in the unity of his essence there do exist the co-equal, co-eternal, consubstantial personal distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, each officially coacting in the work of redemption, yet in the creation and in the progress of the redemptive scheme the Son of God, the second person of the one divine essence, is the prominent external figure of the revelation made to man. Nevertheless the whole Godhead therein is exhibited in an administration marked by infinite power, wisdom, and love. Such partially is the method of the divine mediatorial work. The purpose of this discussion is answered without further pursuing this point.

But if the mode in which God exists be that of a divine trinity, and his method in the redemption of man be that of coactive personal distinctions of the one infinite essence, is a divine objective history possible? Most certainly. He surveys his own ordained events as a history external to himself, and there are successive stages and degrees of increment toward a "fullness of time" in that history. There is an unfolding of divine purposes, a successive execution of divine offices, and the bringing forth, in regular order, of subjects, agents, and witnesses of the mediatorial plan.

To human view, the first stage is the catastrophe of sin on the earth, an event foreseen and provided for remedially. A promise ensues of a coming incarnation and a victorious self-offering as a sacrifice for the offending race. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," is a promise also of the great deliverance from the tempter, and victory over the destroyer and over sin. On the support of this promise, good men of the old world lived and died; and Enoch, apprehending its import in full, entered upon the highest walk of faith, and, too holy for that dark and profligate time, "he was not, for God took him." But while a few thus caught the grand

truth of the redemption, the bulk of the race went down in hopeless idolatry and crime, and the remedy against them for the fortunes of the world was their extinction by a deluge. A single trustworthy family only survived, and the hope of the future through them was that of a higher civilization to be built up by the more advanced principles they had attained from the expansion of the original promise, now more clearly explained and reinforced by additional revelations.

From this epoch "the fullness of time" began to gather perceptible increase, both in richer intellectual and civilizing results from the new peopling of the earth, and in frequent mediatorial communications with men. The promised incarnated One, the Jehovah of the Old Testament, from the beginning figured as the all-ruling Divinity, and theophanies, on fit occasions, transpired to give to waning faith a real substance on which to stand. In the growth of populations, however, the knowledge of the true Jehovah grew dim and the sanctity of the name relaxed, so that a selection from men of true and enduring fidelity to God became a necessary expedient.

Abraham was called and instructed by wonderful processes and providences. With him and from his time dates the giving out, on the part of Jehovah, without such vagueness as previously existed, the germ at least of every Gospel truth which the New Testament contains. And to preserve and develop these truths, as well as to make a visible and definite line for his own incarnation in due time, Jehovah organized Abraham's posterity as his own visible people. After conducting this people through instructive vicissitudes—through sojournings, and famines, and bondage, and desert life, to final organization as a nation—He planted this typical people upon an isolated tract by themselves, almost completely severed from contact with idolatrous civilized nations around. Every thing tended toward typical indications with this people. Their country—the land of Canaan—was itself typical of great spiritual conquests in the future militant and triumphant Church. This location, though not entirely secure, was yet the best for central and prominent position, standing as a bridge to Africa and Asia, and a gateway to Europe as well; and its surroundings of the Lebanon spurs on the north, of the great deserts on the east and south, and of the harborless Mediterranean on the west, served to ren-

der invasion by foreign powers exceedingly difficult. Here were this people under Jehovah's special discipline. Here the Decalogue and the sacrifices and the prophets restrained passion, taught the conscience, and pointed to a priestly, prophetic and royal Messiah. Here at every step the law and the ritual guided, as a schoolmaster, directly to Christ. Here, too, were historic presages—hints, types, moral delineations—of that glorious coming personage. The people in general seemed too stupid or besotted to perceive what was here thus offered to their apprehension; but many good men did see them, and in dim faith waited for the redemption of Israel. Out of these gathered delineations they saw "the King in his beauty," "the Shepherd of Israel," "the Angel of the Covenant," "the King of glory," etc. They saw, too, his humble forerunners. They saw his own lowly birth, his outraged innocence, his violent sufferings, and his deliverance and triumphs, his ultimate victories and rule over the whole earth. Only a glance indeed can be taken now at the many things they did see scattered over all this history.

The fortunes of this chosen, this typical people became diversified more and more until the close of their history as a nation. They became heedless of their theocratic ruler and of what he claimed from them; they rebelled and fell, then were soon swallowed up and scarcely heard of any more among foreign peoples who made them captives and slaves.

Nevertheless a remnant is restored; the line of the house of David is kept intact in the land; and though the tone of Jewish ideas and worship grows secular and materialistic, though public piety dies out, though formalism and immorality have full sway among the masses, yet the principle of divine selection narrows—a faithful few there are, true descendants and representatives of the family of the promised Holy One, who, though poor and obscure, have never broken allegiance, and the more for their fidelity under such disadvantages are they the deeply loved ones of Jehovah. "In the fullness of time God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." The fullness of time now comes, and Jehovah, who hitherto has kept Israel under the severe tuition of the law, who has taught the full heinousness of sin and the absolute need of its propitiation by the shedding of blood other than that of bulls and goats,

whose providence over the world in general, and over Israel in particular, in the ages gone by, has been most essentially mediatorial, who has silently governed the ages and the nations till now a uniform civilization and a one national rule spreads over civilized earth, who has ordered the growth of the intellect of the world to such degree that the old religions it has fostered are without power any longer to satisfy—Jehovah, who has brought affairs to a crisis like this, the most momentous in the world's history, has produced a stage where the past is darkness and twilight to the now opening future, lightened by the sun rising to pour its mid-day glory on the ages yet to come.

The Incarnation! Here, indeed, we touch again upon the line at which revealed truth shades off into inaccessible mystery. But if faith shrinks here it may as well shrink at all mysteries with which our hourly existence is bound up; and what we take upon trust in other things may as well be surrendered too, and the vast amount of what we know, obtained only on the basis of trust, must return to blank nothingness.

But however deep the mystery here, a visible occasion now transpires to show that the highest thought we can have is that God is eternal love. By past mediatorial demonstrations we have known that God is power, and the creation is the monument of his power. But above power is love, and God can now fittingly project himself into the mind of the world *as* Infinite Love by a stupendous act of grace of which Incarnation is the monument. God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son; and he sends him forth to the view of the world—begotten not of man but of the Holy Ghost—born of a woman, indeed, so as to be of our humanity—born of an obscure and lowly maiden in obscure Nazareth, sheltered away there from the corrupting Judaism of the day, quietly solacing herself with the great promises of the house of David.

After the lowly birth, which, by divinely devised incident, occurs at Bethlehem, the city of David; after the flight to Egypt, and thirty years of obedient, industrious life at Nazareth; after his full miraculous investiture of office at the baptismal waters, and his forty days of fasting and temptation in the desert, he entered on his marvelous ministry, "and we beheld his glory"—writes one of his disciples forty years afterward—"we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten

of the Father, full of grace and truth." Who is this mysterious person? "He is the Word made flesh that dwelt among us;" the Incarnate Word, a designation for Jehovah, the infinite personal agent of the Old Testament ages and administration. He is the God-man—of intrinsic necessity such—long prophesied of and long expected—the desire of nations. He is the one that was to come; all history in the past is a prophecy of him. The course of events, human and external, tended toward him. Mind, in its progressive development, unconsciously aspired after him. And when he came humanity found its oneness, and the history of humanity its final cause in him.

Just now his person challenges every-where the most intense interest as never before. Why is this? He has ever ruled the world, and he rules now. Human thoughts and acts are free and unconstrained *entirely*, but when projected he has control of them, and in his use of them they run in lines and on to ends mediatorial. Perhaps the lines cross and recross each other so repeatedly as to end in a reticulated and, to human view, a confused mass; but out of it, by a long elaboration, is evolved a result at length which becomes a great objective thought, striking, no one knows how or why, the mind of the period, and compelling attention to it. In this manner, no doubt, important mediatorial stages and crises occur. May we not have come to a time when the result, wrought in this or in some analogous manner, is the person of Christ as the great objective thought or question of the day? Obviously the question of Christ's person came to some minds with a momentum sudden and unwelcome, and because it could not be beaten back nor evaded, the attention given to it has been reluctant and unfriendly, and the subject has been treated with a criticism of unsparing severity. This has inured to increased interest, and through criticism, *per contra*, to firmer conviction in the infinite divinity of Christ as God-man. Attention is now universally aroused to the words of Christ himself, and the more they are pondered the stronger is the confidence accorded to them.

He ever called himself the Son of man, the meaning of which is found to be that he is the elder brother of the race—in an important sense the head of the race, ordained as the

second Adam to repair the fortunes of the race which the first Adam was seduced to destroy.

He ever called himself no less the Son of God. The attempts in some quarters to make out this a designation of later times is puerile. It is his own designation, and can be denied by no one. This testimony in his own behalf is to be found in the synoptic Gospels as well as in that of John, the date of which is vainly wrested by ruthless criticism from its proper place. He calls himself the Son of God, too, in the absolute sense, the sense implying the relation of essence and nature—not the sense in which men or angels are sometimes so called by virtue of creation or of moral likeness to God. He speaks of his pre-existence—"Before Abraham was, I am." He speaks of his pre-existent glory, "Of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was." He speaks of his oneness with the Father and of his self-revelation of the Father—"No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him." In numerous statements like these he includes himself in the Godhead, makes himself sharer in the nature of God, and in such sense it is that he calls himself the Son of God. In a single personality, therefore, he is both the Son of man and the Son of God—*the God-man*—Godhead and manhood united in one person.

The irrepressible vanity of human reason clamors against the possibility of such a conception. But why not possible? The authority of Holy Scripture, admitted ever as at least a possible authority, assures that the world and all things were created by him and for him, with reference especially to man. He made man in his own image, with the purpose that he should receive God into his nature and have him for the indwelling object of his thoughts and desires, and of his whole inner life. Since this indwelling object has been lost from the soul of the race, in all parts of the earth there has been an indefinite craving for it; there has been at least an ignorant seeking for something, an earnest but often grievously mistaken aim for the real thing that should meet the real moral wants of man. Every-where, and in all ages, heathenism has illustrated the cry of Job, "O that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat!" and all fitting is it that out of things possible with God the fullness

of the Godhead should dwell bodily with Jesus, in order that from his fullness man should receive grace upon grace. The possibility of Incarnation, therefore, seems required by the nature and wants of the human race. Added to this, not the possibility alone, but the necessity of the incarnation is required as a measure on God's part by which to project from himself impulses of condescension and love in behalf of man. The Incarnation of the Son of God becomes, hence, a postulate of which the human soul cannot be deprived. The relation between man's absolute wants and the proceeding by which they are to be met on the part of man's Creator, fixes a necessity that can be answered only by incarnation. The soul's remedy for its deep-down darkness and guilt could not be met but by a Redeemer as much man as God, as much God as man, both natures in one accessible, sympathizing, omnipotent Person.

And such was Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in the fullness of time sent forth, made of a woman, that is, begotten of the Holy Ghost, but born of and from our nature. He was made also under the law, was of the Old Testament dispensation, but at its summit, and all the prophetic, priestly, and kingly elements centralized and terminated in him. It is a mistake to suppose law and grace dissevered, the latter merely supplementing the former. The system of the Gospel, indeed, is at the foundation of that of law. Law and grace are inseparably and eternally one. But law in its ritualistic character is an expedient—the schoolmaster pointing, in all its observances and restrictions, to Christ and his salvation. Justification under the law was impossible except through faith in the Christ, the world's great sacrifice, of whom all sacrifices in the Old Testament are but the one and ever continuous type.

Abundantly he magnified and made honorable the law, for no teacher on earth ever rescued the law so searchingly from false glosses that had been put upon it. He kept it perfectly himself; he was not chargeable with the least sin, nor had he the least taint of it; and, after two or three years of indefatigable labor, of teaching, and beneficence, he submitted to die upon the cross, an instrument of torture and death inflicted only on malefactors and slaves. But he went willingly to death, though the preliminary suffering, and that endured on the cross, were doubtless such as fall not within the imagina-

tion to conceive. In the midst of it, however, he prayed for his persecutors; proclaimed pardon and a place in his kingdom to the thief, his fellow-sufferer; commended his mother to the disciple whom he loved; and was to the last a completed revelation of love. The waves of wrath for man's sin were going over him, but perfectly unsullied remained his mighty integrity as the God-man. He sought propitiation, and shrank not from unheard-of agony to accomplish it. He yielded his life, but by his own power resumed it on the third day, as he had predicted; and in glorified visitations taught his disciples forty days, then ascended above into the holy of holies, man's High Priest and King forever. Never need men to suffer want of his companionship and aid, for he said, as he went up, "I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Never need they lack the atonement of any, the darkest sin, for he has completed all in himself, and is forever in his own person Priest, Altar, Victim, Mercy-Seat.

Art. V.—JEPHTHAH'S VOW.

It may seem bootless to add another essay to the discussion of a subject on which volumes have been already written; but a large proportion of the expositions of Jephthah's vow most commonly accessible, advocate a theory which it is the purpose of the present article to controvert, and it is only by repeated investigations that many disputed passages of Holy Writ will be likely to reach a final settlement. In the October number of this Quarterly for 1855 appeared an article maintaining that Jephthah never meant to vow a human sacrifice to the Lord, and did not offer his daughter as a burnt-offering, but consecrated her to a life of perpetual celibacy. It is proper that the same Review contain as full and fair a presentation of the other side of the question.

The writer of the article referred to correctly resolves the various expositions of Judges xi, 29–40, into two opposing theories, that of *immolation* and that of *consecration*. According to the one Jephthah literally sacrificed his daughter as a burnt-offering to Jehovah; according to the other the daugh-

ter was not put to death at all, but was made a sort of vestal virgin, a female Nazarite for life, and thus set apart to a state of perpetual virginity. The advocates of this latter theory have never, so far as we are aware, claimed in support of their exposition the literal and most obvious import of the sacred narrative. They have quite generally admitted, that were it not for inherent difficulties all readers would naturally adopt the theory of immolation. But they contend that Jephthah must have known that human sacrifices were an abomination to Jehovah, and that his faith and piety, as extolled by an apostle in Heb. xi, 32, were incompatible with his offering a human sacrifice; and further, that the prominence given in verses 37 and 39 to the fact of her *virginity* is to serve as the clue to a correct interpretation of the whole passage. Hence the literal and obvious import of the Scripture history is set aside because of supposed inherent difficulties.

The gist of the whole question rests chiefly on the exposition of two verses, 31 and 39; but the entire section is involved in the discussion, and should be placed before the reader's eye. The English version is as follows:

[29] Then the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah, and he passed over Gilead and Manasseh, and passed over Mizpeh of Gilead, and from Mizpeh of Gilead he passed over unto the children of Ammon. [30] And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, [31] Then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering. [32] So Jephthah passed over unto the children of Ammon to fight against them: and the Lord delivered them into his hands. [33] And he smote them from Aroer even till thou come to Minnith, even twenty cities, and unto the plain of the vineyards, with a very great slaughter. Thus the children of Ammon were subdued before the children of Israel. [34] And Jephthah came to Mizpeh unto his house, and behold, his daughter came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances: and she was his only child; besides her he had neither son nor daughter. [35] And it came to pass, when he saw her, that he rent his clothes, and said, Alas, my daughter! thou hast brought me very low, and thou art one of them that trouble me: for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back. [36] And she said unto him, My father, if thou hast opened thy mouth unto the Lord, do to me according to that which hath proceeded out of thy mouth; forasmuch as the Lord hath taken vengeance for thee of thine ene-

mies, even of the children of Ammon. [37] And she said unto her father, Let this thing be done for me: Let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains, and bewail my virginity, I and my fellows. [38] And he said, Go. And he sent her away for two months: and she went with her companions, and bewailed her virginity upon the mountains. [39] And it came to pass at the end of two months that she returned unto her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed: and she knew no man. And it was a custom in Israel, [40] that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year.

Let us, first of all, carefully examine the language of the vow; for if the judge of Israel kept his word, and, as verse 39 declares, did with his daughter according to his vow, it is all important that the exact import of that vow be ascertained, and every possible construction of its words be fully weighed.

The English version, "*Whatsoever* cometh . . . I will offer *it*," is possible, but is here scarcely correct. The Hebrew הַיּוֹצֵא אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא, is literally, *The one coming forth who comes forth*, and therefore *whosoever* would convey the exact sense of the original better than *whatsoever*, and the corresponding *it* would naturally be rendered *him*. This rendering, however, is supported more by the immediate context than by any thing in the Hebrew that necessarily requires it. Keil says:*

> Going out of the doors of his house to meet him, is an expression that does not apply to a herd or flock driven out of the stall just at the moment of his return, or to any animal that might possibly run out to meet him. For the phrase *go out to meet* is only applied to men in the other passages in which it occurs. Moreover, Jephthah no doubt intended to impose a very difficult vow upon himself. And that would not have been the case if he had merely been thinking of a sacrificial animal. Even without any vow, he would have offered, not one, but many sacrifices after obtaining a victory. If, therefore, he had had an animal sacrifice in his mind, he would certainly have vowed the best of his flocks. From all this there can be no doubt that Jephthah must have been thinking of some human being as at all events included in his vow.

One clearly untenable construction of this verse is that which gives the suffix pronoun *him* (הוּ) a dative sense, and refers it to the Lord. Thus, *I will offer* HIM (that is, the

* "Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary on Judges," translated for "Clark's Foreign Theological Library," by James Martin. Page 385. Edinburgh. 1868. This quotation may have the more weight with some, from the fact that this eminent critic and scholar rejects the theory of immolation.

Lord) *a burnt-offering.* In this case the vow is made to contemplate two things: (1) a person to be consecrated to Jehovah, and (2) the additional offering of a burnt sacrifice. Such a construction, however, would be a solecism in Hebrew. If that were the meaning, how natural and easy to have used the common expression לוֹ, *to him.* The cases referred to by Gesenius, where the suffix to the verb is supposed to be used for the dative, (Zech. vii, 5; Job xxxi, 18; Ezek. xxix, 3, 9,) are capable of a different explanation, and he himself remarks that they are instances of "an almost inaccurate brevity of expression." In each of the cases referred to the suffix is of the first person, and is therefore capable of a more reflexive rendering than would be possible in a case, like the one in our passage, of the third person. The same distinguished philologist thus states the rule of grammar here involved: "The suffix to the verb is, properly, always the accusative, and is the most common form of expressing the accusative of the pronoun." * In 2 Kings iii, 27, where it is said the King of Moab took his eldest son *and offered him a burnt-offering upon the wall*, we have precisely the same construction. Compare also 1 Sam. vii, 9. This exposition, therefore, though having the support of some distinguished names, and commended by Bishop Lowth, as having "perfectly cleared up a difficulty which for two thousand years had puzzled all the translators and expositors," must, on critical grounds, be set aside as utterly untenable.

Another attempt to explain away the ordinary sense of one of the words of this verse is Keil's "spiritual interpretation" of עוֹלָה, *a burnt-offering.* He says "that no exactly corresponding parallelism can be adduced from the Old Testament in support of the spiritual view," but "there were persons in Israel who dedicated their lives to the Lord at the sanctuary by altogether renouncing the world, and there can be no doubt that Jephthah had such a dedication as this in his mind when he uttered his vow." This is a most pompous begging of the question, and unworthy of the distinguished commentator, who is usually so careful and discreet. But he proceeds: "The word עוֹלָה does not involve the idea of burning, like our word burnt-offering, but simply

* Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, translated by Conant. Page 216. New York. 1861.

that of going up upon the altar, or of complete surrender to the Lord. עוֹלָה is a whole offering, as distinguished from the other sacrifices, of which only a part was given to the Lord. When a virgin, therefore, was set apart as a spiritual עוֹלָה, it followed, as a matter of course, that henceforth she belonged entirely to the Lord; that is to say, was to remain a virgin for the remainder of her days." * It will not be claimed that, etymologically, there is any thing in the word עוֹלָה that conveys the idea of burning; but what avails this statement in the face of the fact that, according to the Hebrew *usus loquendi*, עוֹלָה, elsewhere always designates a burnt-offering, or, in the language of both Gesenius and Fürst, a "sacrifice to be wholly consumed." Much that Keil advances will seem very plausible to some; but so far as it goes toward setting aside the common meaning of the word עוֹלָה, it will be accepted by few. There is a manifest striving after something which the Scripture nowhere offers, and a prodigious effort to get rid of the common meaning of an oft-recurring word. When the critic himself admits that the word in question has nowhere else such a meaning as he would put upon it, he virtually yields all argument, and gives us mere assumption and assertion.

Another and very popular rendering of this verse is that given in the margin of our English version, and supported by many commentators, which takes the conjunction Vav (ו) in a disjunctive sense, and reads, *Shall be the Lord's*, OR *I will offer it up for a burnt-offering.* The import of the vow would then be, as Kinchi and others have paraphrased it, "I will offer it for a burnt-offering if it be fit for such a purpose; or, if not fit for that, I will consecrate it to the Lord." † So popu-

* Keil and Delitzsch's *Commentary, in loco.* Substantially the same view is maintained by Hengstenberg in his *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, (Dissertation IV,) and also by Paulus Cassel in Lange's *Bibelwerk.* But such a deep spiritual sense of burnt-offerings as this passage would involve was alien to the age of the Judges. Every passage cited in Hengstenberg's Dissertation on this subject fails most signally to help his argument. (Hos. xiv, 2; Psa. xl, 7–9; li, 17; cxix, 108.) Take, for instance, the passage oftenest quoted, Psa. li, 16, 17, where the spiritual idea of sacrifices in general is expressed, and the sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart, so far from being identified with *burnt-offering*, is put in direct opposition to it.

† A writer in the "American Biblical Repository" (for January, 1843) devotes an entire article to the defense of this interpretation.

lar and so commonly received is this exposition in some quarters, that it demands a thorough and extended examination.

That the Hebrew Vav, (ו,) like the Greek καί, the Latin *et*, and the same particle in other languages, may in a general sense be said to have various meanings, or shades of meaning, according as it is explanatory or adversative, and in translation may be better represented by some other word or words than *and*, no one will question; but to say that Vav ever properly signifies *or*, or *nor*, is to hazard a most uncritical and untenable assertion. In his exposition of Jephthah's vow, Dr. Hales affirms that "the paucity of connecting particles in the Hebrew language made it necessary that this conjunction (ו) should often be understood disjunctively." But this writer, and others who have made the like unfounded assertion, would have done well to tell us what use the Hebrews made of their common and proper disjunctive אוֹ, which is used more than a hundred times in the Old Testament in the sense of *or*.

Let us examine the passages in which it is claimed that Vav must be rendered disjunctively. The examples ordinarily adduced are the following. Exod. xii, 5: "Ye shall take it out from the sheep *or* from the goats." But here the rendering *or* is not necessary. The sense is that the sheep *and* the goats were the animals from which they were to select the paschal lamb, and the Hebrew idiom did not require the further and more minute specification that in case they found not a proper lamb among the sheep, they might take one from among the goats. Exod. xxi, 17: "He that curseth his father *or* his mother," Gesenius thus explains: "Here the verb refers not to one *or* the other, but to both; he that curseth his father AND he that curseth his mother," etc. The same may be said of other similar passages. Take next a negative construction. The Hebrew of Lev. xxvii, 28, (a passage often cited as proof that Vav means *or*,) is not literally as the English version expresses it, "No devoted thing . . . shall be sold *or* redeemed," but "Every devoted thing . . . *shall not be sold* AND *shall not* be redeemed." The לֹא, *not*, is repeated in the second sentence.

The above cited passages represent all the cases that are commonly adduced in evidence of the disjunctive sense of Vav, and of all it may be easily shown that the Hebrew idiom required no such construction as these writers pretend. That

the general sense of the Hebrew may in some of those passages be more simply put into idiomatic English by means of a disjunctive construction may be readily granted, but this is a very different thing from admitting that *and* sometimes means *or*. And least of all is it permissible to bring in such unparallel passages to fix the sense of Vav in the simple and positive phraseology of Jephthah's vow. The absurdity will be at once apparent if we attempt to render disjunctively any of the *ands* in the language of Jacob's vow at Bethel, (Gen. xxviii, 20–22,) or that of Hannah at the Tabernacle, (1 Sam. i, 11.)

But what do the great masters in Hebrew philology say on this subject? The late Moses Stuart, that American Coryphæus in Hebrew scholarship, in making certain strictures on a geological dissertation of Professor Edward Hitchcock, in which it is affirmed "that Vav discharges the functions of all the conjunctions, both copulative and disjunctive," makes the following caustic remarks: *

> The conjunction Vav discharging all the functions of both the copulative and disjunctive conjunctions in the Hebrew language! Are there any of the megalosauri, iguanodons, or mastodons of geology that exceed the magnitude of such a conjunction? Vav has often been called a Proteus before by many who found it difficult to trace out and recognize all its features; but never before was I aware that this Proteus had become so large as to cover more ground than Typhœus of old. "But Michaelis," we are told, "gives it thirty-seven significations; and Noldius upward of seventy." Be it so; any one who knows fully the fashion of Michaelis' philology will wonder that he stopped short of twice that number; and as for Noldius, this is quite a matter of moderation in him. Good Father Schleusner has in like manner no less than thirty-two meanings for *καί*, the corresponding Greek particle in the New Testament, besides another head of "*haud raro abundat*," and another of "*interdum deficit*." Examples of such unbounded license in making out meanings for words, and such undistinguishing descriptions of the use of words, may be found in many of the older critics, as often and as easily as the art of making gold among the old alchemists, or composing spells to drive away evil spirits among the enchanters. And, by the by, they are entitled to about as much credit.

The opinion of Gesenius is thus given in his Hebrew Lexicon: "That Vav is put as a disjunctive between words is hardly supported by a single probable example; those usually

* In the "Biblical Philosophy" for January, 1836, page 61.

referred hither not requiring such a signification." But to this statement his learned translator, Dr. Edward Robinson, appends the remark that in 1 Kings xviii, 27, "it is difficult to avoid the disjunctive sense of Vav," and notes the fact that in his Lexicon under כִּי Gesenius himself admits for that passage this disjunctive sense. That one passage in Kings, then, would seem to have been the only one on which these eminent Hebraists wavered, for they give no intimation of any other instance where it is "difficult to avoid the disjunctive sense of Vav." Surely, then, they would never have presumed to teach that this particle is to be taken as a disjunctive in the simple diction of Jephthah's vow.

But let us turn to 1 Kings xviii, 27, as the ground of final appeal, and examine the "difficulty." The English version is, "Cry aloud: for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." This, doubtless, gives the general sense of the original; but is it possible that Dr. Robinson accepted it as giving the literal and exact import of the Hebrew? If so, here surely was an instance where for once *good Homer dozed.* Nothing is plainer, on a careful examination of the original, than that the several sentences after *cry aloud* are given ironically, *as so many reasons why the Baal worshipers should cry aloud.* Literally and accurately the verse is thus to be rendered and explained: *Cry with a great voice;* [your god needs a mighty noise to call his attention to these parts, where his interests are sadly at stake!] *because he is God:* [he is, of course, the supreme Deity!] *because* [not *either;* here is no Vav at all, but simply the causal particle כִּי,] *he is talking;* [or as the margin, *he meditateth*, he is, forsooth, in a brown study, and just now knows nothing else!] *and because* [not *or*, for that fails to bring out the *causal* sense here prominent; an additional reason is given, equivalent to *and furthermore, because*] *he has gone aside;* [or, more strictly, *a withdrawing is to him;* a euphemism for going aside at a call of nature; as in Judg. iii, 24: "He covereth his feet in the summer chamber,"] *and because he is on a journey;* [gone traveling, and ought to be called home again to take care of his worshipers, who are greatly distressed by his absence!] *perhaps* [here again is no Vav, but simply אוּלַי,] *he is asleep and should be*

awaked. How is it to be shown that in this passage Vav must necessarily be rendered by *or?* We challenge any critic to show error or incorrectness in our translation and exposition of the passage, and if our rendering is true to the exact import of the Hebrew, then certainly there is here no "difficulty in avoiding the disjunctive sense of Vav." And this appears to be the final instance of appeal to Hebrew usage, and we may, therefore, safely deny that Vav ever has the meaning of the disjunctive *or.* So fully settled does this question seem to be in the mind of Dr. Julius Fuerst, the latest, and in some respects the highest, authority in Hebrew Lexicography, that in his Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon he ignores the whole controversy, and gives no intimation that Vav was ever believed to have the sense of the disjunctive *or.* He who, in view of all the facts in the case, would contend for the disjunctive sense of Vav, might about as well say that ו means או, and *καί* means *ἤ*, and *et* means *aut*, and our English *and* means *or!* Only in this way the absurdity becomes too apparent to be defended.

We must, therefore, conclude that the marginal reading of Judges xi, 31, OR *I will offer*, etc., and all expositions of Jephthah's vow based on such reading are false and misleading, and should be utterly repudiated by all who are unwilling to be superficial in criticism, or hasty and careless in forming their opinions.

It follows, then, that the only translation of the language of Jephthah's vow that will bear the test of criticism is substantially the following: "Whosoever comes forth from the doors of my house to meet me when I return in peace from the sons of Ammon shall be for Jehovah, and I will offer him for a burnt-offering." Jephthah did not utter his vow in the heat of battle, nor in a moment of confusion. If he meant any part of it to be conditional, or contemplated diverse methods of fulfilling it, the Hebrew language did not lack words by which to express precisely his intention. How, then, can we avoid the conviction that in using the language given above he had a human being in his mind? What else could he expect to come out of the doors of his house to meet him? Surely not a cow, nor a sheep, nor a goat,* nor a herd of these animals, for

* So Augustine, as quoted in Keil: "He did not vow in these words that he would offer some *sheep*, which he might present as a holocaust, according to the

their place was not in his *house*, nor would they be thought of as *coming out to meet him*. And surely not a dog, or any other unclean animal. No animal, clean or unclean, would be designated with such lofty emphasis and deep solemnity as appear in the wording of this vow. "Quid enim esset," says Pfeiffer, "si magnus quispiam Princeps vel archistrategus diceret: Deus! si hanc mihi victoriam concesseris, vitulus primus, qui mihi occurrerit, tuus erit!"* How strange it would be if some great prince or general should say, "O God, if thou wilt grant me this victory, the first calf that comes to meet me shall be thine!" Well might he add the Horatian proverb, "Parturiunt montes, nasceter ridiculus mus!" Every feature of the passage indicates that Jephthah consciously vowed the sacrifice of a human being, and the tremendous force and awful solemnity of the vow appear in the very fact that not a common offering, but a human sacrifice is pledged, and the victim is to be taken from the members of his own household.

Having reached this decision as to the meaning of Jephthah's vow, we must next deal with the fancied *crux interpretum*, how the offering of a human sacrifice was compatible with Jephthah's faith, piety, and knowledge of the law of Moses. The question is a fair one, and demands a fair reply; and a careful inquiry into the real character of Jephthah's faith and piety, and the probable extent of his acquaintance with the law, will not only help to a proper understanding of this much disputed subject, but will also lead to an exposure of many unfounded notions of the sanctity and moral purity of several distinguished personages of that olden time.

We first examine the Scripture evidences of Jephthah's faith and piety. The assumption that his victory over Ammon was given as a sign from heaven that God approved his vow will hardly be urged by any respectable divine. As well might one assume that Saul's rash vow (1 Sam. xiv, 24) brought vic-

law. For it is not, and was not, a customary thing for sheep to come out to meet a victorious general returning from the war. Nor did he say, I will offer as a holocaust *whatever* shall come out of the doors of my house to meet me; but he says, 'Whoever comes out I will offer *him*;' so that there can be no doubt whatever that he had then a human being in his mind."

* *Augusti Pfeifferi Dubia Vexata. De Voto et Facto Jephtae.* Page 356.

tory to Israel's arms that day when Jonathan offended. We quote with approval the remarks of Bush:*

> The public interest of the whole Jewish people was more regarded in the bestowment of the victory than the private hopes or wishes of Jephthah. We see no reason to doubt that the result would have been the same with the same means, even had no vow whatever been uttered. Moreover, it is a high presumption in weak mortals to read in the events of Providence a proof that God makes himself a party to compacts of their own voluntary proposing, let them be ever so well intended. His counsels are a great deep, and it is at our peril that we put such unauthorized constructions upon his dispensations.

The following is Clarke's assumption: "He could not commit a crime which himself had just been an executor of God's justice to punish in others."† A most unwarrantable assertion to put in the face of history, which again and again records how God used idolators themselves to punish Israel for adopting their own idolatry. And did not Gideon, after having been commissioned to overthrow idolatry in Israel, set up a gorgeous ephod in Ophrah which became a snare to his own house, and to all Israel? Did not God inspire Solomon to write and speak in the strongest terms against the very sins into which he afterward so foully plunged? Strange assumption, that God could not raise up to eminence and power and use a bold freebooter of the border to punish the sins of the children of Ammon!

But it is urged that according to verse 29, "the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah;" and it seems to be assumed that this expression is substantially identical with the New Testament "gift of the Holy Ghost," and implies the possession of great spiritual purity of heart and life. The fallacy of this position will be seen by examining and comparing the connection in which the expression is elsewhere used in the Book of Judges. In chapter iii, 10, it is used in connection with Othniel's judging and going to war; in vi, 34, with Gideon's blowing the trumpet to assemble the people for battle; in xiii, 25, with Samson's occasional feats of strength in early life; in xiv, 6, with his rending a lion; in xiv, 19, with his slaughter of thirty Philistines; and in xv, 14, with his breaking the cords by which he was bound, and slaying a thousand men with the jaw-bone of an ass. In all these passages it is

* Bush's "Notes on Judges," *in loco.* † "Clarke's Commentary," *in loco.*

clear beyond controversy that the Spirit of the Lord coming on the judges is to be understood of the *mental and physical power* with which they were specially qualified for performing signal acts of valor. Not in a single instance is the idea of personal holiness, in the New Testament sense, necessarily involved at all. The Spirit of the Lord also came upon Saul at Ramah, when he had murder in his heart, and he stripped off his clothes and fell down "and prophesied before Samuel, and lay down all that day and all that night," (1 Sam. xix, 24;) but will any one argue from that fact the eminent saintliness of Saul? In Jephthah's case the expression in question refers *not to his vow*, but to his military march against the children of Ammon. See verse 29. It is no more said, as stating a cause and its effect, that "the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah and he vowed this vow," than it is said that "the Spirit came upon Samson and he went in unto Delilah." Of this expression, as used in the Book of Judges, we may safely say with Bush: "It simply implies the divine bestowment of remarkable gifts, whether *physical* or *intellectual*, for the performance of a particular work, or the discharge of a particular office. The endowments indicated by it were seated rather in the head and the body than in the heart, so that, taken by itself, it affords us no clue to the *moral character* or *actions* of the subject of it."

It is also argued, sometimes with an air of assurance that would seem to put an end to all controversy, that an inspired writer of the New Testament in Heb. xi, 32, *commends Jephthah's faith.* Granted; but be it noted that the inspired writer *does not commend Jephthah's* vow. Mark his words: "The time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah; David also, and Samuel, and the prophets." What part or act of their lives, now, shall we suppose this verse commends? All they ever did, or said, or were? Then must we include Barak's cowardice and distrust of God's word, and Gideon's idolatry and polygamy, and Samson's intercourse with the harlot of Gaza, and David's lies, and adultery, and murder of Uriah—all as furnishing the ground of the apostle's praise?

The writer of the Hebrews goes on through the six following verses to specify particular instances of faith which distin-

guished the ancient worthies, but in all his allusions there is not an instance which can with any rational probability be made to mean the consecration of one's daughter to perpetual celibacy. Did it ever occur to the advocates of the consecration theory, that for a father to doom his daughter, in the bloom of her youthful beauty, to a life of seclusion and celibacy, and thus rob her of all the honors and joys of Hebrew womanhood, could scarcely be the ground of an apostle's commendation? The only specifications which naturally allude to Jephthah's case are in verse 34: "Waxed valiant in fight," and "turned to flight the armies of the aliens;" and these may include other cases besides Jephthah. They certainly may refer to his march against the Ammonites, and the victory with which God crowned his arms; but who will contend that they must also include all he said and did during that war, or before and after it? This would be even more absurd than to contend that God gave him the victory to show his divine approval of his vow.

The faith and piety of those ancient worthies, often so noticeably deep and admirable, was at the same time compatible with many sins of ignorance and error. The faith of the harlot Rahab, likewise extolled in the Epistle to the Hebrews, was compatible with what the ethics of the New Testament would pronounce a life of shame and an act of falsehood. Jephthah's vow, as we view it, was an act at once of mighty faith and fearful ignorance. The King of Moab's offering of his son for a burnt-offering was unquestionably an act of piety; and the Hindoo suttee, who immolates herself on the funeral pile of her dead husband, gives an example of profoundest faith. The spirit of all these acts of faith, as viewed from the standpoint of the worshiper, is one thing, and their moral quality, as seen in the light of Jehovah's law, is quite another. From our Christian stand-point we cannot commend or admire the vow of Jephthah, and numerous fearful acts of heathen devotees: We rather shudder at them. But we cannot and must not ignore and deny the spirit of exalted faith and piety which underlies them all. The correctness of one's doctrinal opinions is no sure criterion of his heart's faith in God. The Lord Jesus found more than once among the Gentiles a faith unparalleled in Israel.

We suppose that it is not a strange doctrine, nor a commonly rejected notion, but rather the position of the ablest divines, that great faith and most ardent piety are compatible with exceedingly gross and erroneous apprehensions of God and religious worship. Whedon says:*

> The reason may not reveal a Creator in the fullness of his attributes, nor even prevent the worship of a God through finite symbols and images, which the Scriptures, given for the very purpose of maintaining the pure idea of the Deity, prohibit as *idolatry*, under severest penalty, especially to the chosen race, whose special mission was the preservation of the pure idea for the development of future ages. The conscience may not furnish an absolutely accurate code of ethics; but it furnishes principles which are *relatively to the individual* right, and safe in the eye of God *for him* to follow. . . . Such a man will act under many a sad delusion, and commit many things intrinsically wrong; but the saving fact is that he acts with a *purpose* which *wants but the light of truth* in order to his being truly right.

The question, then, of Jephthah's faith and piety need not be further entertained. All remaining difficulty turns upon his supposed knowledge of Jehovah's law. The law said: "Thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God." Lev. xviii, 21. Comp. Lev. xx, 2; Deut. xii, 13, 18, 10. Who can believe, it is asked, that Jephthah, a judge of Israel, with these passages of the Pentateuch before him, could vow to sacrifice a member of his own family a burnt-offering to the Lord?

Let it be observed, that at this point the whole controversy turns upon *a supposition*. The opinion that Jephthah knew human sacrifices to be abominable in the sight of God has, so far as we are aware, nothing to support it but the bare *supposition* that a judge of Israel must needs have been acquainted with all the laws of Moses. And yet this supposition has been the main strength of the consecration hypothesis. Take this away, and the other arguments which have been brought to its support would hardly have been urged.

But is this supposition supported by any certain evidences? We propose to raise over against it certain counter *suppositions*, and then inquire whose suppositions are best sustained by

* "Whedon on the Will," page 348.

Scripture evidence. Suppose, then, on the other hand, that Jephthah had no knowledge of these commandments of the law. Suppose that in that loose and degenerate period thousands in Israel had lost all knowledge of many of the precepts of the law. Suppose that Jephthah, early exiled from his father's house, had fostered in his heart prejudices against the whole religious *cultus* of the Hebrews. Suppose that in his wild border life, as chieftain of a lawless band of warriors, he had seen and known as much of Ammonitish as of Israelitish worship. Suppose that the most of his knowledge of Israelitish worship had been learned when Israel had forsaken the Lord, and was given over to the service of "Baalim and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, and the gods of Zidon, *and the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon.*" Judg. x, 6. Suppose, in view of all these facts, that he had never learned to distinguish or appreciate the difference between the Israelitish and heathen systems of religion,* and hence knew not but the God of Israel would be pleased with a human sacrifice as well as the gods of Moab and Ammon.

Now these, we grant, are *suppositions*, but they are brought to bear against a counter *supposition* not half so well supported. We propose to show that the Scripture account of Jephthah's life is so far from affording any evidence of his extended acquaintance with the law, that it gives on the contrary several intimations, from which our suppositions made above flow forth as most natural inferences.

First of all the fact, which the Book of Judges surely makes no secret, that that was a loose, lawless, and degenerate period of Hebrew history. "There was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Judg. xvii, 6. Compare chap. ii, 16–19 and 21, 25. The repeated rebellions, the multiplied idolatry, the strange, dark fact that Gideon, after all his revelations and blessings from Jehovah, made a costly ephod for all Israel to go whoring after, the story of Micah's idols, together with all the incidents of violence and blood recorded, show fully enough that whatever knowledge of the Law still lingered in some quarters, its precepts sat lightly upon the masses of the people. There is evidence that

*"In his reply to the Ammonites he seems to recognize their god Chemosh as a co-ordinate power with Jehovah," (verse 24.) Wordsworth's Commentary, *in loco.*

the Pentateuch was in existence, but equal or greater evidence that its moral precepts were little studied or observed.* The statute of Deut. xxxi, 10–13, requiring the public reading of the Law before all Israel once in seven years, had probably fallen into neglect, and if not, the tribes east of the Jordan would hardly have gone to hear, and least of all Jephthah.

Another fact, not to be overlooked in this argument, is Jephthah's early exile from his father's house. He was the son of a harlot, and when his father's lawful sons grew up they thrust him out of their inheritance, and he fled to the land of Tob which bordered on the Ammonitish territory. The elders of the eastern tribes appear to have had some hand in this expulsion of Jephthah, (comp. chap. xi, 7, 8,) and all this might have gone very far to prejudice the young exile against the religion and customs of the Hebrew State, and to make him care little for any religion. Add to this the notable fact that about the time of his expulsion the multiplied idolatry described at chap. x, 6, must have been at its height in Israel. In addition to adopting and serving the gods of nearly all the nations around them, they went so far as to serve even "the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon." To what extent they worshiped Chemosh and Molech we are not told; and yet some critics, while forced to admit that the people had most wretchedly sunken into idolatry, urge that we find no trace of human sacrifice among them. We may leave the impartial student of history to judge whether it is clear and safe to say that, while they apostatized from Jehovah, and openly served those gods whose most signal honor was the offering of human sacrifices, they never, even in a single instance, served them with that special honor. How baseless, too, is the assertion of Alexander,† that "it is not until idolatry had taken firm hold of the Israelites that we find such sacri-

* Jephthah's message to Ammon, chap. xi, 14–26, reveals a very full knowledge of Israelitish history, and the information was probably given him by the elders. It is an argument for the antiquity of the Pentateuch, but no proof that Jephthah, or even the elders, were as well versed in the religious precepts of Moses. It was much more easy and natural for Israel, especially the eastern tribes, to preserve a knowledge of their history and warlike traditions, and claims to certain territorial possessions, than of specific precepts and ordinances of religious worship.

† Dr. W. L. Alexander, in his Addendum to the article Jephthah, in Kitto's new Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature.

fices regarded by them otherwise than with horror." Where is it possible to find evidence of more extended and universal idolatry, and of a darker night of heathenism in Israel, than that afforded in Judges x, 6? In the age of Jehoshaphat and the later kings there were multitudes of prophets who kept alive among the masses of the people the true knowledge of God, and uttered many an oracle against the idolatry of the kings, but no trace of the like in Jephthah's day. The gods of even the hated Ammonites were freely worshiped among the chosen people, and how natural for the youthful Gileadite, under all the circumstances of his lot, to suppose that the substance and methods of religion among all the nations were about the same, and since human sacrifices were offered by some nations, and he had possibly known of instances even in Israel, they entered into and helped to form his notions of what would be most specially noble and pleasing in the sight of God.

Then came his lawless life of border warfare and adventure. "There were gathered vain men to Jephthah, and went out with him," (verse 3.) The eastern and north-eastern desert, and the dark glens of Bashan, were their home. "It is a remarkable fact," says Porter,* "and it shows how little change three thousand years have produced on this eastern land, that Bashan is still the refuge of all offenders. If a man can only reach it, no matter what may have been his crimes or his failings, he is safe. The officers of Government dare not follow him, and the avenger of blood even turns away in despair." So Jephthah, like Ishmael when exiled from his father, became a wild Bedouin of the desert, and probably the greater portion of his life had been thus spent, when, on account of his fame as a mighty warrior, he was called to be head and captain over all the inhabitants of Gilead. And what supposable opportunities did that wild border life afford him for becoming acquainted with the law of Moses? If there was great ignorance of the law in the very heart of Israel, and near to Shiloh, where the Tabernacle, and Ark, and Priests and Levites were, what greater ignorance must have prevailed far off on the wilderness border of Ammon? These considerations lead us to conclude, that, so far from being absurd or impossible, it was

*J. L. Porter: "Giant Cities of Bashan," page 14.

both natural and probable that Jephthah's knowledge of the law was exceedingly meager and confused, and that the savage discipline of his border life, often in contact with the Ammonites, had led him to suppose that the sacrifice of a human being was the noblest possible offering to God.

We now pass to examine the sequel of the history, and notice other expositions. Jephthah went and fought against the Ammonites, and "the Lord delivered them into his hands." He doubtless regarded his victory as largely owing to his vow to the Lord, and now that vow must be fulfilled. He returns, probably with quivering heart, to his house at Mizpeh, and lo, the first person that comes to meet him is his daughter, leading a company of maidens to celebrate his victory "with timbrels and with dances." Immediately his soul breaks out in a consternation of agony and grief. He rends his clothes, and cries, "Alas, my daughter, thou hast brought me very low, and thou art one of them that trouble me; for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back!" He had probably hoped to meet first some other less cherished member of his household, but lo, here comes his "only child; besides her he had neither son nor daughter!" To sacrifice her is to end his family, and "quench his coal" (2 Sam. xiv, 7) upon the earth. Hence the facts of her virginity, and of her being the only child, are emphasized.

With sublime heroism she accepts her fate. There was a point of view from which it was noble and enviable thus to die, "forasmuch as the Lord hath taken vengeance for thee of thine enemies, even of the children of Ammon," (verse 36.) Die she must, sooner or later, and no more honorable death than this could ever be hers. One thing, and one only, darkened the thought of death, and that was her virginity. Could she only have perpetuated her father's house and name; could it only have been that sons and daughters survived her to take away her reproach among women, then there would have been no pang in her death.

> But she went mourning, "No fair Hebrew boy
> Shall smile away my maiden blame among
> The Hebrew mothers; emptied of all joy,
> Leaving the dance and song,
> Leaving the olive-gardens far below,
> Leaving the promise of my bridal bower."—TENNYSON.

This thought of dying unwedded and childless was to her the sting of death. Take away that thought, ever so full of bitter sorrow to a Hebrew woman, and with Jephthah's daughter it were a sublime and enviable thing to die for God, her country, and her sire.

But the vow had been uttered, and it must be paid, and she desired it should be. Only one thing she asks, a respite of two months to withdraw to the mountains and bewail her virginity. Mark, *not to bewail her death*, for that, alone considered, might be regarded as a glorious end, but to bewail that which gave her death its only woeful pang, and was to her far worse than death itself—a thing above all others most deplorable in the estimation of that age and race—the fact that, in the flower of youthful womanhood, she must end life *without a husband and without a child.* It is difficult for us with our loose attachment to a coming age, and familiar with the modern lack of interest in posterity, and the noticeable desire among multitudes of females to remain childless, to appreciate the depth of feeling on this subject among the Hebrew women. A husbandless and childless state was a reproach to a marriageable female. Keil makes a misleading assertion when he says: "To mourn one's virginity does not mean to mourn because one has to die a virgin, but because one has to live and remain a virgin." More truly should it be said that the expression has as much respect to the past as to the future, but contemplates not specially life or death, but *the fact of virginity.* For we might naturally ask, If she knew she was to live and remain a virgin, and be shut up in solitude or seclusion for all her subsequent life, what sense or object in taking those two months to mourn? And then in what sense would she be more really consecrated to celibacy *after* than *during* the two months of sorrow? Far more natural, as we conceive, would it have been for her in that case to have said, Let me stay at home, and enjoy the scenes of common life a month or two, since I must give all after life to tears and solitude. "If," says Cappel in the *Critici Sacri*, "she desired or felt obliged to bewail her virginity, it was especially suitable to bewail that when shut up in the monastery; previously to her being shut up, it would have been more suitable with youthful friends and associates to have spent those two months joyfully and pleasantly,

since afterward there would remain to her more than sufficient time for weeping." *

But the two months passed, and she returned to her father, and he "did with her according to his vow which he had vowed." This plain and positive statement affords no room to quibble. It throws us back for the meaning of his act to verse 31, which contains the language of his vow. Whatever act his vow contemplated, that certainly he did. Nothing more, nothing less. He truly kept his word. He had opened his mouth to the Lord, and notwithstanding all his anguish, he went not back from his solemn word, and, according to our previous exposition of his language, we can understand nothing else than that he offered her for a burnt-offering unto the Lord.

But according to some the additional remarks in verse 39, *and she knew no man*, indicates the manner in which he fulfilled his vow. "It is not expressly stated," says Bush, "that she was offered up for a burnt-offering. Instead of saying, as would naturally, on that supposition, have been expected in a transaction of such moment, 'he did with her according to his vow, *and offered her up for a burnt-offering to the Lord*,' the writer simply affirms 'he did to her his vow, *and she knew no man*,' as if this were intended to be explanatory of the *manner* in which the *doing* of the vow was accomplished, namely, by devoting her to a life of celibacy. Why else is this latter circumstance mentioned, but to show wherein the accomplishment of the vow consisted?" All this, we answer, springs

* "Si flere virginitatem vel voluit vel oportuit, certe tum demum flere illam decuit cum monasterio includenda fuit; antequam vero clauderetur, decuit potius cum amicis et sociis puellis spatio duorum illorum mensium vitam agare laetam et jucundam, siquidem postea lugendi tempus plus satis longum illi superat."

These words of Cappel sufficiently offset the opposing question which is sometimes raised, Why, if she was doomed to death, did she not spend her last hours in her father's house, and enjoy all the comfort she could through the short respite of her life? But besides raising the same question against the opposite theory, we may say that to one doomed to death, and having but two months to live, home would hardly afford any comforts, and earth's sociality and joys any pleasure. It is not human under such circumstances to rejoice amid home joys. The mountain solitudes would be more congenial to the feelings of the dying maiden than any thing she would be likely to find in her father's house. Then also we might add with Cappel (as quoted in Keil): "Her lamentations were devoted to her virginity, and such lamentations could not be uttered in the town and in the presence of men. Modesty required the solitude of the mountains for these."

chiefly from a failure to appreciate, or a disposition to ignore, the inexpressible gloom and sadness that in the Hebrew mind hung over a childless death. Surely the clear and positive statement which Bush, while assuming to give the literal rendering of the Hebrew, fails (purposely?) to bring out fully in his note—*he did to her his vow* WHICH HE HAD VOWED (אֲשֶׁר נָדַר)—needed no such addition as is above proposed, for such an addition would have been altogether superfluous. But if the vow, as expressed in verse 31, contemplated a human sacrifice, (and this Bush himself is constrained to admit,) and if, instead of offering her as a burnt-offering, he devoted her to a life of celibacy, then plainly he did NOT according to his vow which he had vowed, but contrary to it, and the mere addition, *she knew no man*, would be a most inexplicably strange way of informing us that Jephthah failed to keep his word! And Bush's subsequent suggestion "that the Spirit of inspiration may have framed the record as it now stands, marked by a somewhat ambiguous aspect, *in order to guard against a light estimate of the obligation of vows*," is a pitiable case of special pleading, and only betrays the weakness of his arguments. The sacred historian uses no needless word, and does not attempt to picture the sad and fearful spectacle of Jephthah's act, but he records, not as the manner in which he did his vow, but as the most thrilling knell that in the ears of her father and companions sounded over that daughter's funeral pile, and sent its lingering echo into the after times—*she knew no man.*

Additional evidence in support of the consecration hypothesis is sought in the provisions of the law respecting vows. It is claimed that Jephthah might, in accordance with the law of Moses, have devoted his daughter to perpetual celibacy. And before showing the futility of this claim, let us for a moment grant it, and ask, What then? Granted that at the time he "opened his mouth unto the Lord" he *might* have vowed to make his daughter a Nazarite for life. No one, we presume, will stop to dispute that he *might have vowed* a host of things which it is very certain he never did vow. He might have vowed with a terrible oath, like Saul, (1 Sam. xiv, 24,) to slay every warrior of his army that tasted food before the victory was won. He might have vowed to offer all the sheep and

oxen in the land of Gilead. But it is very idle to talk about what he might possibly have done, when the record of his action affords no room for any such conjecture.

It is true that the Law (Num. vi, 2) made provision for both male and female Nazarites; but without urging the fact that we have no scriptural instance of a female Nazarite, and that the language of the Law (Num. vi, 3–12) supposes in every case a man, and no razor would, in any case, be likely to come upon a woman's head, it is all-sufficient for our purpose to emphasize the fact that the Nazarite vow *never involved a life of celibacy.* Feeble and fragile is Keil's opposing statement: "The fact that Nazarites contracted marriages, even such as were dedicated by a vow to be Nazarites all their lives, by no means warrants the conclusion that virgins dedicated to the Lord by a vow were also free to marry if they chose." We answer, "The conclusion" here specified receives far more warrant from "the fact that Nazarites contracted marriages" than it possibly can from the utter absence of any fact or law to the contrary. The notion that the women who "assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation" (Exod. xxxviii, 8; 1 Sam. ii, 22) were virgin Nazarites, is also an unwarranted assumption. The Nazarite vow involved abstinence from wine, and certain other things, but not abstinence from marriage, and there is no hint or intimation that a life of celibacy was ever thought of in connection with such vow. So all this talk of Jephthah's imposing a Nazarite vow upon his daughter utterly fails to prove any thing in the case.

Attempt is also made to bring Jephthah's case under the head of the *singular vow* described in Lev. xxvii. "The law provides for the estimation of the amount at which the child or the adult might be exonerated from the personal discharge of such vow by a commutation in money, as an equivalent for the service due, whether the devotement was made by the parent or by the individual himself." * But here again there is no shadow of evidence that the relation to God which such vow imposed was incompatible with the conjugal relation. And then, did it never enter the minds of these reasoners, that this whole statute *provides expressly for the releasing of persons from the obligations of such singular vows?* If Jephthah was

* Comfort's article in "Methodist Quarterly Review" for 1855, page 561.

acquainted with this law, he must have known that for ten, or at most for thirty, shekels of silver he could completely exonerate himself from his vow, and his plea that he could not go back would have been altogether untrue. What, then, has all this show of argument about the law of a Nazarite, and of the singular vow, to do with the case of Jephthah and his daughter? The statement of Dr. Kitto stills remains unrefuted: "To live unmarried was required by no law, custom, or devotement among the Jews; no one had the right to impose so odious a condition on another, nor is any such condition implied or expressed in the vow which Jephthah uttered." * The hypothesis that Jephthah's daughter was devoted as a nun, says Stanley, "is contrary to the plain meaning of the text, contrary to the highest authorities of the Church, contrary to all the usages of the old dispensation." †

The exposition of Louis Cappel,‡ that Jephthah devoted his daughter to the Lord, according to the law of the חֵרֶם, *cherem*, (ban or "devoted thing," Lev. xxvii, 28, 29,) demands no extended attempt at refutation. The fundamental idea of the *cherem*, as applied to persons, was that of a forced devoting to destruction of those who obstinately refused to devote themselves to Jehovah; and the impossibility of connecting such an idea to Jephthah's case is thus forcibly shown by Hengstenberg:

(1.) The *cherem* necessarily supposes in its objects impiety, decided enmity against God, and moral corruption; but Jephthah's daughter was a virtuous, pious young woman. (2.) Sacrifice and *cherem* are in direct opposition. The vow of a sacrifice could never be fulfilled by the presentation of a *cherem*. (3.) The *cherem*, according to its idea, was a divine prerogative, and appears as such every-where, both in the law and the history. Men are only instruments in performing it, to fulfill the mandates of the divine will. The *cherem* was never any thing devoted arbitrarily by man, or without express divine direction. Otherwise every murderer might shelter himself under the injunctions respecting it. §

A passing notice must also be taken of the hypothesis of Bush, who supposes that during the two months the affair be-

* Article *Jephthah*, in Kitto's Cyclopedia.

† "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church," page 397.

‡ *De Voto Jephtae* in the *Critici Sacri*. Tomus II, pages 2076–2086.

§ Hengstenberg on the "Genuineness of the Pentateuch," Dissertation IV.

came the subject of discussion and lamentation throughout the whole nation. He imagines that when the vow passed Jephthah's lips it "partook more of the character of the *cherem* than the *neder*, and that he was subsequently instructed by "the authorized expounders of the law" that a burnt-offering was incompatible with the nature of a *cherem*, "and that the law having made no provision for the latter being substituted for the former, he was, even according to the very terms of his vow, rightly understood, not only released, but prohibited from performing it." Accordingly he conceives that Jephthah executed his vow by devoting his daughter to perpetual celibacy —"a mode of execution which did not, in the first instance, enter into his thoughts." *

We doubt if this hypothesis ever clearly satisfied its ingenious author, or any body else. The one and all-sufficient answer to it is, that from beginning to end it is a tissue of conjectures, and can claim no support whatever from the sacred narrative. It may do for poets and romance writers to weave such fancies around the facts of Scripture history, but for a grave commentator sagely to give us such conjectures for exposition is to begin a new era in sacred hermeneutics.

But Bush inquires: "If she were really put to death, is it not strange that the fact of her death is not once spoken of?" The fact of her death, we answer, is sufficiently indicated in the statement, "He did to her his vow which he had vowed;" and as for the silence of other parts of Scripture on the subject, that surely is no more strange than its silence on a hundred other things, on which many would prefer to have had more of detail. With far more show of reason may we ask, How is it, if she was *not* slain, that we have no mention of her after life? The marginal reading, "The daughters of Israel went yearly *to talk with* the daughter of Jephthah," that is, to comfort her in her solitude, is altogether untenable. If that were the meaning to be conveyed, not תָּנָה, but דָּבַר or שִׂיחַ would have been employed. If with the English version, and all the ancient versions, (Septuagint, Vulgate, Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic,) we render לְתַנּוֹת *to lament*, we may well remark with Kitto, "People lament the dead, not the living." But if we render *to commemorate* or *celebrate*, as is undoubtedly the cor-

* Notes, page 164.

rect translation of the Hebrew, the same remark will still apply, for people are not wont to go at stated anniversaries to commemorate or celebrate a living person. It was natural for the daughters of Israel to go yearly and celebrate the sublime devotion and lofty heroism that haloed round the memory of the saintly maiden; but if the maiden were still living in the mountains were they went to praise her, it is inexplicably strange that no intimation of that fact is given.

Some have been puzzled to know by whose hands Jephthah's daughter could have been sacrificed. It would have been unlawful, they urge, for Jephthah to have done it, for to offer burnt-offerings was the prerogative solely of the priests, and surely the priests at Shiloh would not have polluted the tabernacle with a human sacrifice. This difficulty is all imaginary. A reference merely to chapter vi, 19, 20, 26, 27, and chapter xiii, 19, of this same Book of Judges is sufficient to show that in that age it was no uncommon thing for persons to offer burnt-offerings without the presence or aid of priests, and also at places remote from the tabernacle. And the man who, like Jephthah, supposed that a human sacrifice would be pleasing to Jehovah, would not be likely to scruple over forms. Ignorant of the law against human sacrifices, he would be still less likely to know the customs and regulations of the Levitical priesthood; and to suppose that between the time he was made judge and the time he did his vow he must have learned much of the law of Moses, is to suppose what has no evidence in the Scriptures.

Finally, it is said that our exposition enables the oppugners of divine revelation to urge a capital objection against the morality of the Bible. But how is this possible when the Bible nowhere approves or sanctions Jephthah's vow? Must we accept as divinely sanctioned every action in Bible history that is not specifically condemned by some sacred writer? Amazingly shallow are they who presume to oppugn divine revelation with such logic, or they who seriously fear the attacks of such oppugners. As we have said before, we shudder at Jephthah's ignorance and superstition. Our Christian instinct revolts from his bloody deed. But, with the daughters of Israel who lived in that darkest of historic ages, we

cannot but commemorate and extol the mighty faith and zeal of Jephthah, and the sublime devotion of his daughter.

We may appropriately close this essay with the words of Stanley:*

As far back as we can trace the sentiment of those who read the passage, in Jonathan the Targumist, and Josephus, and through the whole of the first eleven centuries of Christendom, the story was taken in its literal sense as describing the death of the maiden, although the attention of the Church was, as usual, diverted to distant allegorical meanings. Then, it is said, from a polemical bias of Kimchi, arose the interpretation that she was not killed, but immured in celibacy. From the Jewish theology this spread to the Christian. 'By this time the notion had sprung up that every act recorded in the Old Testament was to be defended according to the standard of Christian morality; and, accordingly, the process began of violently wresting the words of Scripture to meet the preconceived fancies of later ages. In this way entered the hypothesis of Jephthah's daughter having been devoted as a nun; contrary to the plain meaning of the text, contrary to the highest authorities of the Church, contrary to all the usages of the old dispensation. In modern times a more careful study of the Bible has brought us back to the original sense. And with it returns the deep pathos of the original story, and the lesson which it reads of the heroism of the father and daughter, to be admired and loved, in the midst of the fierce superstitions across which it plays like a sunbeam on a stormy sea.

Art. VI.—THE POSITION OF CALVINISM.†

There has been put into my hands a late number of the "Methodist," with a leading editorial entitled "Schaff on American Theology." I propose to make some observations

* "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church." First Series, page 397.

† The paper which follows was originally designed as a communication for the columns of the "Methodist," in answer to a leading article from a source unknown to me. This will account for its familiar tone, and for portions which may seem less fitting to the pages of a solid Quarterly. But it grew upon the hands of the writer to its present size, and, being placed in the hands of one of my distinguished Methodist Episcopal brethren of Madison, was by him designated to its present place, where, by the courtesy of the Editor, it appears. It was written several months ago, as its readers will perceive, but its publication has been unavoidably delayed until now.—R. A.

We cheerfully insert the communication of our respected contributor, under condition of our making free but respectful annotations.—Editor.

upon this article. *Audi alterem partem* is the only principle by observing which we arrive at clear light. While I do not mean to be understood as agreeing with other parts of the article, yet I design to look at one or two special statements, which are statements of facts, and facts in regard to which, it seems to me, Calvinists ought to be the most competent witnesses.* The following extracts are the portions to which I refer: "The Arminian revolution of opinion, which has nearly eliminated the Augustinian theology." "It (Methodism) has leavened all American Protestantism. Few, if any, American divines would now acknowledge Calvin's Institutes as their theological standard. Calvinism, whether Sublapsarian or Supralapsarian, is now seldom uttered in American pulpits. The general religious consciousness of the country recognizes it as effete."

These are surprising assertions. I almost held my breath as I read them. If you should read in any of our most highly accredited Presbyterian papers the statement that Calvinism had nearly eliminated the Arminian theology, you would be as much astounded as we are; and if you respected the author of the statement as much as we respect the "Methodist," you would very likely pause, and take a fresh breath, to know whether you really were alive or not.

Permit me to premise, that what I shall say will be from the Presbyterian stand-point. There are other Calvinistic bodies of power in the land. The Protestant Episcopal Church in its seventeenth article of the "Thirty-nine" asserts the clearest Calvinism.† The whole article might well have come from Calvin's own pen. The Confession of the (Dutch) Reformed Church is identical with the "Thirty-nine Articles;"

* However intelligent or honest, men are not always "competent witnesses" in their own case. In the present issue Calvinists are rather the parties than the witnesses. If Calvinists can testify how fast they have held to Calvinism, those who have for a century stood at issue with them may be quite as good witnesses how much they have yielded and how far they have retreated.

Trust not yourself, but your defects to know,
Make use of every friend and every foe.—Pope.

And yet we suspect that many, we know not how many, Calvinistic preachers would confirm the statement of the "Methodist."

† Lord Chatham said that "the English Church had a Popish liturgy, a Calvinistic creed, and an *Arminian* clergy." It is very possible that an American Church may have a Calvinistic clergy and an Arminian laity.

and it also distinctly adheres to the Canons of the Synod of Dort on the famous "Five Points," among which are Predestination, Election, and Perseverance. The two great Baptist bodies of the land, the "Regular Baptists" and the "Baptists South," are distinctively Calvinistic in their creeds; the latter especially pronounced in the third article, on "God's decrees." To these add the numerous and influential Trinitarian Congregationalists, who have indeed no one authoritative human platform, but whose Calvinistic belief is vastly in preponderance. Other bodies need not be mentioned, though there are others still, outside the Presbyterian fold, and not unimportant.

That the creeds of these Churches are held with various degrees of strictness we are all aware. The doctrinal creed of the Episcopal Church sits lightly on its clergy, although there are not a few firm Calvinists in its communion. Our Reformed brethren hold the Augustinian theology with tenacity; while among the Baptists, both North and South, are found many of the most uncompromising Calvinists in the land. Even after due allowance for the men who do not profess to hold their doctrinal creed in any strict way, it is yet probable that the Calvinistic doctrines are professedly held by *at least* half the Evangelical Churches and ministers in America.

These Churches have their theological seminaries, whose Professors teach their doctrines; they have their ordaining bodies, examining candidates for the ministry, and requiring assent to the standards; and some of them have more or less authoritative expositions of the standards, written by their men of highest mark, and published with the denominational imprint. Now whether these theological teachers and ministers would assent to the proposition that the Arminian revolution of opinion has nearly eliminated [" eliminate, *to expel, to thrust out*"— *Webster*] the Augustinian theology, it is for them to say. They would probably deem the question, if propounded to them, the most extraordinary one they were ever called to answer.*

* Possibly. And when *we affirm* and *they deny*, the fair issue is made.

Our respected brother will note that our question is not what theological professors teach in their schools, nor what are the printed articles of faith accepted by the ministry, nor what the preachers themselves believe, nor what they *claim* to

Speaking now from the Presbyterian stand-point, I deem it true to say that whatever changes in doctrinal views, or in forms of doctrinal statement, have occurred among us, these changes have not been the result of the progress of Arminian-

have, as a whole, preached. It is, *What kind of sermons do the people in Presbyterian pews hear?*

If a census could be taken, we think it would be found that there are now in the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, induced by personal or other advantages, many thousands of Methodists, or at least Arminians, by education and belief. If all the Arminians in Presbyterian pews were to evacuate, they would leave a decidedly thinned Church. When questioned about it their uniform reply is, "We hear no preaching to which a Methodist could object." When we state the doctrines of the Presbyterian Articles, they reply that "no such doctrines are now preached." If the thousands of Methodists in this position were all asked at once, in every part of the land, we have every reason to believe, by fair induction from ample facts of our own experience, that such would be their unanimous answer.

So late as the last evening before this present writing we were accidentally informed by a well-educated gentleman of Methodist principles and antecedents that for the last two years he had attended the Presbyterian Churches in various parts of the country, and had "never heard any Calvinism." The two years previous to that his father, a leading Methodist layman, and himself had been temporary members of a Congregational Church in Ohio, and both agreed that during that time they never heard a sentiment advanced which they did not, as Methodists, believe. He added, "They do not preach Calvinism anywhere as they used to." All this was said, as usual, *by way of eulogy* upon them as "liberal" preachers, and in self-defense for attending and supporting their ministry. When, however, we recalled to his mind the real doctrines of Calvinism, as assented to by these preachers, especially as contained in the Presbyterian Articles, and asked him whether (saying nothing against the character of the men) the discrepancy was not a "*fact* of duplicity," he admitted the statement. When we asked, then, what right, as a layman, he had to support even the best of men in a "duplicity," he admitted that he had never thought of it in that light before. Our friend added that the Sunday previous he had heard a talented clergyman of Newburgh preach a sermon in which the doctrine of free-will was clearly brought out; and when we informed him that the free will which said clergyman held was a freedom to choose but one possible way fixed by the strongest motive, just as a clock-hammer could strike but one possible way, determined by the strongest force, he acknowledged himself to have been deceived. Our friend excusingly added that these men had unfortunately inherited their creed; to which we replied, *first*, that it was perfectly in their power to change their Articles, or to enter an Arminian Church; and *second*, that they ought not at any rate to bravely boast, like our friend Dr. Aikman, that they held them as firmly and preached them as abundantly and strictly as they ever did. The essence of this conversation we have had occur countless times; and we believe there are few middle-aged Methodist preachers who have not received similar testimony not only from laymen similarly circumstanced, but from the regular-born Presbyterian membership.

Since writing the above we have put the question to a leading Methodist minister of New Jersey, between whom and Dr. Aikman a cordial friendship exists:

ism. It would probably be true to assert that the "Arminian revolution" has had little or no appreciable influence in producing them.

The Methodist Church * is rapidly becoming † a theological

"What proof is there that predestination has ceased to be preached?" Ample proof, he in substance promptly replied, from the common statements of the Presbyterian membership. Talk with them, and they will uniformly reply, "No such doctrines are preached to us now." He named one of the most accomplished Presbyterian ministers of New Jersey who declared that he had never written but one sermon on the decrees in his life, and that he had not looked at it for many years.

The Editor of the "Methodist," to whom Dr. Aikman replies, has probably had far better advantages to know what preaching comes from the average Presbyterian pulpits than Dr. Aikman himself. He is a Master in Theology. He has for years preached but once a Sabbath, and has habitually attended the various worships in New York and Brooklyn. He is amply familiar with the Presbyterian Churches, and his editorial under discussion is the result of years of personal observation, and its statements, we think, nearly correct.

* The following paragraph is intended to be generous; but, from the writer's unacquaintance with our doctrinal history, is disparaging to such a degree that no well-informed Methodist would accept it.

† "Becoming"? We had imagined, and still entertain no doubt, that we were "a theological power in the land" nearly a century ago; a far greater power in the "Calvinistic controversy" than since. On this subject we call our respected brother's attention to the passage on Methodist Theology quoted from the "London Quarterly" in the Synopsis of our last number.

We assure him that the systematic precision in its theology there ascribed to Methodism has existed in America from the beginning. Wesleyan Methodism took a strongly definite form originally in England in a controversy with Calvinism which shook the whole Methodistic movement to its center. Wesley found the Calvinism of Toplady, Rowland Hill, and Whitefield not only so at issue with his own moral sense, but *so adverse to the conversion of souls*, that he found it necessary to shake it off with a giant effort from Methodism before Methodism could go forth in triumph to the four quarters of the globe. Calvinistic Methodism shrunk into the mountains of Cambria, where it still dwells. Calvinistic Methodism is Wales-wide, Arminian Methodism is world-wide. Our Methodism then took a complete symmetrical theological form. With that same theology, clearly understood and firmly grasped, our Methodism came to America. She found Calvinism in full possession, and an obstacle in her own way in bringing souls to Christ. Our anti-Calvinistic principles, embodied in Wesley's Sermons and Notes, the Doctrinal Tracts, and Fletcher's Checks, issued from the Book Room, were in the saddle-bags, we may roughly say, of every circuit rider. They formed his well-studied body of theology. And what is specially to be marked is this—the several doctrinal affirmations of Methodism are each and all immediate spiritual forces to the production of conversion and holiness. A Methodist preacher is not obliged, as Dr. Aikman will soon tell us that Nettleton did, to postpone his doctrinal sermon to the end of a revival. Every Methodist sermon in a revival is the preaching of a Methodist doctrine, and, divested of dogmatic technicals, tells on the conversion of sinners and the perfecting of saints. And when Dr. Aikman tells us,

power in the land, but its distinctive work, until of late, has been its practical work of Christian aggression. Its energy and success in this we all acknowledge to the glory of God. To speak thus is no more disparaging to your Church than it

as he soon will, that Coke and Asbury had something higher to do than to preach Arminianism, we reply, Certainly not; *to preach Arminianism* was their highest duty, and they did it plentifully and well. The doctrine of free-will (disburdened of necessity or predestination) flung all the responsibility of sin on the sinner; the doctrine of unlimited atonement (disburdened of partial reprobation) opened free salvation for ALL; the doctrine of "gracious ability" encouraged and brought the sinner to faith; the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit led the convert to communion with God; the doctrine of possible apostasy warned him to maintain the constant assurance of a *present* salvation; the doctrine of entire sanctification inspired him to whole-souled effort for the attainment of every height of holiness. It was this emancipation of the Gospel and of the sinner from all fatalistic shackles, this glad proclamation of a free, a full, and a perfected salvation from sin, in short, *this anti-Calvinism*, thrilling through every nerve and fiber of Methodism, that has caused her to bound exulting as the roe through the earth.

Now we repeat it, emphatically repeat it, dear Dr. Aikman, Methodism in her joyous and saving career did find Calvinism the dark and baneful antithesis and obstacle to these glorious truths. Calvinism taught the sinner that God willed his every sin; it taught him that all his choices were the necessary effect of circumstances; it drove him into hopelessness by the decree of reprobation; it made God a monster who damns men for the sin he has decreed; it taught the believer that he must never indulge the full assurance of salvation, and at the same time claimed to comfort him by telling him that if he is a Christian, he may live at his ease, he can never be lost; it checked his aspirations for holiness, and made him easy in lukewarmness to be assured that he must expect no complete earthly power over sin. Numbers of our early preachers, having been educated as Calvinists, knew by terrible experience its pernicious effects through years of Antinomianism, or reprobate despair, or hatred of God as depicted by Calvinism. Others encountered it in the excuses and pleas of sinners for sin, truly unanswerable, assuming Calvinism to be true. Others encountered it in the deadness and formality of Churches lying on the lees of assured perseverance and necessary sinfulness. Others encountered it in the skepticism which its repulsive picture of God and its appalling doctrine of reprobation for decreed sin presented. From one end of their extent to the other our ministry put on their high Arminian armor, and for fifty years at least, with an ability seldom surpassed, poured broadsides from their ranks. *The large body of the first generation of Methodists in some sections had been Calvinists*, or were people who had never heard any Gospel but election and reprobation, and were shriveling into indifference and infidelity by reaction against it. The news of a free salvation called them as alive from the dead.

Our own personal ancestry, originally Calvinistic, became Methodists. Our own boyhood and young manhood witnessed and shared the fervor of the battle. So far from there having been no "collision," as Brother Aikman imagines, there was probably but a small minority of towns where the opposing influences did not meet and mingle and modify each other. In this way a great and powerful people has been formed *largely from among Calvinists*. But for twenty-five years past it has

is to our country, to say that it is just becoming a literary and scientific power in the world. It is the glory of a man, of a Church, and of a nation, to do the work which God puts on either to do first. As you well say, Whitefield did not come to spread his Calvinism in America; and so did not Coke and Asbury go forth to the prodigious labors of their lives that Arminianism might be spread. These all had other and higher work to do. So true is this, that the Articles of Faith of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, adopted in 1784, contain no distinctive Arminianism; nothing whatever to which a Calvinist cannot cordially subscribe. This shows the life-purpose of Wesley, by whom the Twenty-five Articles were sent over to this country, and also of the pioneers of Methodism in America, whose imperishable work was built upon so broad a charity.*

Having performed these labors you have lately entered upon others, organizing colleges and theological schools,† (not made strong in a day,) with men of mark and learning at their head, such as the honored men near me, with whom it is my privilege to have Christian and profitable association. Your time has come to issue commentaries,‡ to produce theological tomes, to compact into printed forms your system of belief, and logic-

sounded along our lines that *the battle is over.* All through the land we understand from Methodists familiar with Calvinistic Churches, from their own membership, and from eminent ministers of those Churches, that Calvinism is seldom preached. The result of this impression, sharply as our amiable brother resents it, has been PEACE. The preaching of our own doctrines has taken the pure practical form, and direct antagonisms against Calvinism have generally ceased. As the field has broadened and the population has thickened, each side has had enough to do without antagonizing the other. And then they have so often found each other blessed auxiliaries, side by side, in the same blessed work of Christian good-doing, that they have forgotten to debate.

* There is nothing in our Articles against Universalism. Dr. Aikman forgets that Wesley's Notes and Sermons are as truly theological standards, on strict theological points, as our Articles.

† It was not by theological schools that Christianity overthrew Paganism, but by an appeal *ad populum.* Without any such schools, until very lately, the doctrinal system of world-wide Methodism has been all that the "London Quarterly Review" claims; far more precise, consistent, and systematic, and far more firmly and unitedly held, than Calvinism with all her schools and tomes.

‡ On the contrary, our age of great commentaries seems to have long passed. For nearly a century our Book Concern has issued in huge quartos and octavos the Commentaries of Wesley, Adam Clarke, Joseph Benson, Dr. Coke, and Richard Watson. Their great excellence has forestalled enterprise. We were endowed at start with

ally to show its relations to and its differences from the theologies of other Churches.

Will it be deemed presumptuous for me to suggest, that in the collisions of thought which this work will bring about, and is even now bringing, Calvinism may possibly modify Arminianism* quite as much as the latter the former, although neither will ever eliminate the other?

But further, the changes to which I allude began many years ago, and were the manifest result of causes within our own body; and the Presbyterian Church, in its earliest days, was composed mainly of emigrants from Scotland and Ireland. It frequently sent abroad for its ministers, and when it could, it sent its own young men abroad to be educated for the ministry.

This Scotch-Irish element formed from the beginning, and still forms, a powerful element in our Church. It has learning, piety, and tenacity of purpose. It always inclined to high Calvinism, and to the stricter interpretation of the standards.

Early in our history there came also to the front, men of American birth, like Dickinson and Davies, with the two Tennants, who, though born abroad, came to this country in early life, and were here converted, and were thoroughly American in their sympathies and views; and men from New England, with the modes of thought that even then characterized that region, with readier aptitudes to change, and possibly less reverence for antiquity and great names. Elemental forces are apt to be occult, but they are the mightiest of all; and these two forces have been steadily at work all through our history.

As the future historian of the Great Rebellion will not give its full and true account by telling us of men and parties who on either side led on the vast strife, but only by going back to

a great theology, a great exegesis, a great hymnology, and a great Church polity; in consequence, wisely or unwisely, we have exclusively applied ourselves to a wide, heroic, and eloquent popular propagandism. Ignoring this original endowment, Brother Aikman views us as so many smart paupers who have just scraped up a little capital with a hopeful view to a future pretty good business. This is the common view of his brethren, which they will in time, though reluctantly, correct.

* If we were to undergo any modification on the points debated, it would unquestionably be, in accordance with the great movement of the age, farther and farther from doctrinal Calvinism. Nevertheless, we would gladly and thankfully accept from Calvinists every improvement in piety and in efficiency for the spread of scriptural holiness through the earth. In these respects we testify with pleasure that our Calvinistic brethren at the present day are worthy of emulation.

those two little vessels which in 1620 bore under their white wings two principles of life and death, and planted one in Virginia and the other in Massachusetts, so, in our humbler sphere, no man writes comprehensively of Presbyterian history who loses sight of these two elements of our denominational life. The conflict of these two forces it is that has produced nearly all our upheavals, and most of the changes and modifications, which have occurred among us.* Each side has modified the other, until now we have come to a platform, not of unanimity upon all points, but of understanding and appreciation, which is much, and of absolute mutual and fraternal toleration, which is more. Neither side has been sensibly modified by Arminianism, with which, indeed, neither has come much into collision; although, of course, Presbyterianism has received into itself something of the age it lives in, and of the confluent influences which from all sides pour into the bosom of every living denomination.

Let us now look at the question itself of alleged *changes in*

* Perhaps some light can be shed upon the origin of the difference between these "two forces." Hagenbach's "History of Doctrines," vol. ii, edited by that eminent Calvinistic scholar, Dr. Henry B. Smith, makes the following liberal statements:

"The Arminian Church (of Holland) numbered among its members many eminent men, who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments, no less than by the mildness of their sentiments."—Page 214.

"The Arminian principle, which renounced the authority of the symbolical books, gave such an impulse to exegetical investigation, to independent hermeneutical labors, and to the speculative treatment of theology, that in consequence of the influence exerted by the works of Episcopius and Hugo Grotius, *it was introduced into the whole Evangelical Church.*"—Page 216.

To this we may add, that apparently, under those Hollandic influences, the entire clergy of the English Church, in spite of the apparent Calvinism of their Articles, and even of the implication of infant damnation in their ritual, seceded to Arminianism. At that period the works of the great Puritan Arminian divine, John Goodwin, exerted a powerful influence on Puritanism in England. When Arminian Wesley arose, the Toplady Calvinists of England thought they could call him nothing worse than "the John Goodwin of the age." Side by side with Goodwin, that other great Puritan Arminian, John Milton, fought for the doctrine of liberty of conscience. Now Scotland and Ireland were, indeed, at that time too remote to feel this mild Hollandic breeze; but even English Calvinism softened under its beneficent power, and imported that softening to America. Our respected Brother Aikman is, therefore, requested to consider whether, after all, the mitigation of English-American Calvinism, in comparison with the Scotch and Irish, is not an infusion of Arminianism, coming in very direct and immediate line from the great and good Arminius himself.

doctrine. A correct view of our history will show that these changes have not been of the kind, nor much in the direction, supposed by the writer in the "Methodist." Calvinism, in all its essential views and features, is to-day held throughout the whole Presbyterian Church as firmly and unfalteringly as it ever was. Our theological battle-cries have been Original Sin, Imputation, Depravity, Ability, the Nature and Extent of the Atonement.* These we have discussed, and upon them we

* The essential and universal issue which Wesleyan-Arminianism has taken against Calvinism may mostly be stated in a single proposition. We deny and they affirm the GENERIC PRINCIPLE that *the divine government may inalternatively secure the sin of any being, and then justly damn him eternally for the sin so secured.* We deny, and they affirm, or assume, that *a being can be justly damned for sin which he never had the adequate power of avoiding.* We affirm that adequate, unneutralized power to a volition is necessary to responsibility; *unless*, always, *that power has been responsibly forfeited.*

Calvinism affirms, or assumes, that God may damn beings for sin which they had no adequate power to avoid, in at least the following seven cases:

1. ORIGINAL SIN AND ABILITY.—The whole human race, as fallen in Adam, might be justly damned with an absolutely universal damnation, without any Saviour being interposed or any adequate power of avoidance. At such a view we stand aghast with abhorrence. Arminians hold that a "gracious ability" is necessary to the responsibility of fallen man; Taylorism holds that fallen man has still "natural ability" to repent; his depravity consisting in the free uniformity of voluntary sinning. This last is semi-Pelagianism. We may add that we use the word Taylorism not in disrespect, but as a brief term to designate a systematized view; just as we use the word Arminianism.

2. ETERNAL REPROBATION.—From the above first Calvinistic point it follows, *à fortiori*, that God might pass by as reprobate, and leave in eternal damnation, those who, without any adequate volitional power of avoidance of their own, are involved in the guilt of Adam's sin, so that the reprobates are damned for what they never could avoid. About the most appalling of dogmas!

3. INFANT DAMNATION.—*A fortiori*, it is equally just for God to pass by and leave in reprobation and eternal death any or all infants, as they are merely, like all the others, damned for what they cannot help. Our Arminianism teaches universal infant salvation; Taylorism, so far as we know, accords.

4. WILL POWER.—*A fortiori*, again, no adequate volitional ability, or power of counter choice, is requisite, in order to render any choice or course of choices and actions justly worthy of eternal damnation; so that, again, any being may be justly and eternally damned for what he cannot help. Taylorism teaches that the agent must possess adequate power of choice contrary to strongest motive, though it is certain he will never exert it. Arminianism teaches such power of counter choice unbound by any such certainty.

5. FOREORDAINED DAMNATION.—By an act of irrespective unforeknowing foreordination, predetermining what shall come to pass, the reprobates passed by, and intrinsically incapable of repentance, are decretively consigned to perpetual sin and eternal death. So that reprobates are again damned for what they cannot help.

have divided. Underneath all our debates ruled, indeed, the subtle and prevalent tendencies to which I have alluded—and tendencies are like the tides, greater than the things they bear onward—but these are the things which are written in the book of the wars of the Presbyterian Zion. Upon the distinctive Calvinistic points no differences exist among us which have not always existed, nor any wider differences now than formerly.

It will be in order just here to state what is the Augustinian Theology, or Calvinism, which is the same thing. Not that

6. PAGAN DAMNATION.—All pagans and other persons who never heard of Christ, and never had any means of salvation, are justly damned eternally for that want of faith in Christ which they cannot help.

7. IMPUTATION.—Sin may be justly and literally imputed to the innocent, whether the innocent could avoid it or not; so that Adam's personal sin may with strict justice be imputed as *guilt* in his innocent posterity, and the sins of men may be literally imputed in their guilt to Christ, and he suffer infinite punishment in strict justice, so that a man may be, by intrinsic justice, held responsible for what he did not do and could not help. Arminianism denies the transferability of guilt or literal punishment. The sin of Adam is not imputed to his posterity, nor the sin of man imputed to Christ. Taylorism is here rather Arminian.

Now, whoever holds any one of these seven points, must hold it on the generic principle that a man may be justly damned for what he cannot help; and having once conceded the principle, he has no defense against either of the others. He must in strict logic reject or accept the whole. He can reject any one only by summarily rejecting the generic principle on which the whole are based.

From all this Dr. Aikman, we think, might see two things. First, that *every variation from genuine Calvinism, on all the points he mentions, Original Sin, Imputation, Depravity, Ability, (as well as Free-will and Necessity,) has been in direction toward Arminianism.* It has, in every instance, either approximated to or coincided with our Methodism; or it has overleaped us and vaulted into semi-Pelagianism. Had we space we might demonstrate this on every point. Second, the reason why "New Divinity" men, in Calvinistic Churches, like Taylor, Beman, Fitch, and Finney, were *involved in perplexity and contradiction*, is, that they tried to evade the generic principle of eternal *damnation for the unavoidable* on *particular points*, instead of throwing that principle entirely overboard and coming out upon the broad, free platform of RESPONSIBILITY ONLY FOR THE AVOIDABLE. So bound were they either by their churchly position, their pledged creeds, or by doctrinal prepossessions, that they declined to become thus outright Arminians. The consequence was that they writhed and twisted; they reeled to and fro like drunken men, and were at their wits' ends. They were as weak as effigies under Dr. Hodge's broadsides. As the granting Dr. Hodge his generic principle on a single point grants the whole, so the puny wriggler who has so granted, if he has sense enough to be logical, is as surely brought into Dr. Hodge's theological center as a fly is drawn by the web into the pitiless embraces of a fine old spider.

Calvin held all that Augustine did, for he did not; nor that we are to look at all the views that either of them held.

It will not be denied that even Arminius held much more of Gospel doctrine in common with Calvin and Augustine, than that which he held in distinction from them. The great Dutch and the great Genevan maintained the vital truths of the Gospel system so in common that he who is guided by either will reach eternal life. The writer in the "Methodist" refers to those doctrines which specially distinguish Calvinism from Arminianism; which are these three: Predestination, Election, and the Perseverance of the Saints. By Predestination we mean that* "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will freely and unchangeably

*For a full exposition of this article we refer to our volume on the Will, pp. 420–423. We may here subject it to a brief criticism.

When it speaks of the "liberty" of the agent it does not mean a liberty of the will by which an agent is able to will or choose any otherwise than he will or does choose. The learned Westminster divines held that the liberty of the will is, as before said, just the same as the liberty of the clock-hammer; namely, as the clock-hammer has liberty or power to strike just as it does and no other way, so the will has liberty or power to choose just as it does and no other way. A man chooses freely just as a clock-hammer strikes freely. And this is just the same liberty as all machines possess. But the word liberty in the above quoted article actually refers not to the freedom of the will but to the freedom of the body, namely, that freedom by which the body is necessitated to act as caused to act by the necessitated will. So that this liberty is necessary, mechanical, and fatalistic from beginning to end. And these learned divines hold that God has decreed how this mechanical process shall be performed, and has then decreed that the living machine shall burn in hell forever for the necessitated action by himself so decreed. And that is Calvinism. When, further, the above article affirms that no "violence" is "offered to the will," it means that nothing knocks the will out from under this fatalistic necessity, so but that the necessity has its inevitable course. And when it says that "contingency" is established, it simply means that whereas some "causes" are complete and sufficient for effect in themselves, and others are dependent or "contingent" on the concurrence of some other cause, so God's decree does not change matters so but that the complete are still complete, and the contingent are still "contingent." But if any man imagines that these divines believed that sin could really in any case of its actual commission be avoided, or that the reprobate ever possessed any adequate power of will to escape his decreed or necessitated damnation, he is deceived by their words. Our reader will at once perceive, therefore, that this article has an outside and an inside meaning; it has an exoteric and an esoteric stratum; it has a popular mask and a hideous face. And when it is said God is not "the author of sin" it is simply denied that God is the *committer* of the sin; it does not deny (what the previous words affirm) either that God's will predetermines every sin, or that he sets in train those causations by which each sin is inalternatively secured, and then damns the sinner for the sin

ordain whatever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." The following are the words of President Edwards, which I quote as indicating his agreement with the view of human liberty and the contingency of second causes, as thus set forth by the Westminster standards. He says, "Nothing that I maintain supposes that men are at all hindered by any fatal necessity from doing, and even willing and choosing, as they please, with full freedom, yea, with the highest degree of liberty that ever was thought of, or that ever could possibly enter into the heart of any man to conceive." * By Election we mean that "those of mankind that are predestinated unto life God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious name." By the doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints we mean that "they whom God has accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his

decreed and secured. It thus makes God morally responsible for all sin, and then makes him damn men for the sins of which He alone is justly guilty.

* And this quotation from Jonathan Edwards is of the same deceptive nature. Edwards, like the Westminster Divines, believed that the will possesses no more power to choose otherwise than it does choose, than a clock-hammer possesses, the power to strike otherwise than it does strike. When the will in his view chooses as it "pleases," its "please" is as fixed by the motive as the clock-hammer is by its springs and forces. His argument in showing that no self-determining power of the will can exist, or even be conceived, is held by Calvinists to be one of the most perfect of all demonstrations. And believing that no higher liberty than clock-hammer freedom is even conceivable, he does in the paragraph quoted most delusively pretend that he believes in the highest freedom conceivable; that is, freedom, power of contrary choice, not only does not and cannot exist, but cannot even be conceived. It is as if a materialist, believing only in matter in its three forms of solids, fluid, and vapor, and holding that spirit is inconceivable, should flauntingly maintain that he was a true spiritualist because he believed in vapor, which is the purest and highest *spirit* that any man can conceive. Who does not see that such language not only denies the existence, but the absolute conceivability of spirit? Just so does Edwards here deny the absolute conceivability of volitional freedom.

Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved."

In these doctrines consists essential Calvinism. This is the Augustinian Theology.

Augustine accounts for the fact that some men are renewed, and some are not, by the unconditional decree (*decretum absolutum*) according to which God determines to select from the fallen mass of mankind, the whole of whom are alike guilty and under condemnation, a portion upon whom he bestows renewing grace, and to leave the remainder to their own self-will and the operation of law and justice. The ground and reason of this selection of only a portion of mankind, according to Augustine, is God's wise good pleasure, and not a foreseen faith upon a part of the individual man. For faith itself is a gift of God. It is the product of grace, and grace results from the unconditional decree. . . . The unconditional decree, in reference to the non-elect, according to Augustine, is one of preterition, or omission, merely. The reprobating decree is not accompanied, as the electing decree is, with any direct divine efficiency to secure the result. And there is no need of any;* for, according to the Augustinian anthropology, there is no possibility of self-recovery from a voluntary apostasy, and consequently the simple passing by and leaving of the sinful soul to itself renders its perdition as certain as if it were brought about by a direct divine efficiency.—*Shedd's* "*History of Christian Doctrine*," vol. ii, pp. 70, 72.

Those of us who do not hold all the Augustinian anthropology, and particularly his realistic philosophy and its sequent view of Imputation, still maintain all that is essential in these declarations. We hold that it is by grace alone that salvation is imparted; that the grace proceeds from God's unconditional

* "*There is no need of any*"! No, indeed; for, as it is damning the infinite Gorilla is after securing, it must be admitted that his hapless victims are very efficiently and thoroughly damned without "need of any" direct decree of reprobation. *First*, by foreordination he damns them to hell, an eternity before they are born; *second*, holding them guilty, by an atrocious lie, of a sin they never committed, he doubly damns them; *third*, subjecting them to a paralysis of soul by which they cannot repent without the spirit, and arbitrarily withholding the spirit, he trebly damns them; *finally*, hemming them in by overruling motives to impenitence, without "power of contrary choice," he quadruply damns them. "There is no need of any" quintuple damnation, as Dr. Shedd grimly and truly says. Dr. Aikman seems to imagine that he has here presented the scheme of Calvinistic Reprobation plausibly! We tell him that every fiber of our whole moral nature rises up to pronounce it *accursed!* The polyglot furnishes no language to express the depth of unanimous abhorrence with which our readers will salute its awful face. Among all the haggard superstitions of the earth, Comparative Theology can furnish no more truly diabolical untruth.

decree; apart from grace, nothing but depravity, sin, and death prevail; that the grace is irresistible in the sense that it can, and in the case of the elect does, overcome all sinful opposition, and that this grace of effectual calling God from all eternity decreed to give only to those whom from all eternity he chose in Christ.

Upon these points Calvin's Institutes are in accord with the views of Augustine, and will be so acknowledged. This is, therefore, the Calvinistic Theology.

At this point let it be freely admitted that not all things which either Augustine or Calvin have said upon the mysterious topic of the divine decrees secure the assent of the Calvinistic world, although, even when one disagrees with them, it is impossible not to be profoundly impressed with the solemn scriptural drift of their argument. The same admission must be made with regard to our own Presbyterian Confession of Faith. There is language in it which we do not all adopt. When we take ordination vows we "sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." The *ipsissima verba* theory is not prevalent in our Church; indeed I know no man who holds it, for what more can a man hold with regard even to Holy Scripture itself? And yet I do not mean to say that Presbyterians may not be found who hold to the very language of our standards upon every one of the points here involved. No doubt there are such; men who maintain that inevitable logic and Scripture declarations must push all believers in the doctrines of grace up to high Calvinism. I only mean to aver that, with sporadic exceptions, such as may be found in all denominations, Presbyterians believe and maintain the three great theologic dogmas as here declared. We are all either Supralapsarians or Sublapsarians; or, as Dr. Hodge prefers to say of the latter, Infralapsarians.*

* Dr. Fisk has well said, that when a man has once accepted the awful dogma that *God, irrespective of logically antecedent foresight, has from all eternity fore-ordained whatever comes to pass,* all the condemnable elements by us imputed to Calvinism are implicitly therein contained. All subordinate shadings and variations lose their significance. The differences between Augustinianism and Calvinism, between high Calvinism and low Calvinism, or between the *supra-* or *sub-*, or *infra-* or *subter-lapsarianisms*, are not worth the snap of a baby's finger. The dogma of fore-ordination means that *God decrees the sin, and then damns the*

If, now, any of our Arminian friends lift up their eyebrows at this, as indeed all will to whom the editorial comes as an oracle, we advise them to ask the dozen Presbyterian ministers of their nearest surroundings whether or not they hold the three doctrines essentially as they have been here stated.* As another proof in the same direction, let me venture to predict the nature of the reception which will be given by our ministry to the great work of Dr. Hodge just published, his "Systematic Theology." If a personal allusion may be pardoned, that work will be read by many who, like the writer of this article, are by training, by philosophic theories, and by conviction, compelled to differ from Dr. Hodge upon some points which his great authority may well make us modest in disputing, yet New School, as we once were called, and perhaps are yet regarded, we shall all read his chapter on the "Decrees of God" with clear and solemn assent.

And when we read in Vol. II, Part III, his views on Soteriology, our differences with him will be on the same old topics of Original Sin, Ability, the Nature of Christ's Satisfaction, and its correlate, the Extent of the Atonement: differences, too, which are in no small measure philosophical. And even these will, in many cases, appear to be differences in

sinner for the sin decreed. And such a dogma, by whomsoever held, or wherever expressed, whether in the Presbyterian Articles or in Dr. Hodge's theology, is utterly and infinitely damnable.

* We should need not only to ask of this "dozen" the general question, "Do you preach Calvinism?" but we must be allowed to ask a list of questions to ascertain whether the Calvinism they preach does not skip the true gist of Calvinism. For instance,

Do you preach the doctrine of infant damnation, as taught by the Articles of the Presbyterian Church?

Do you preach, and make the people clearly understand, that God has eternally predetermined and decreed all the sin ever committed, whether murder, blasphemy, perjury, infidelity, whoremongery, drunkenness, or treason?

Do you preach that God has decreed, from all eternity, that certain persons shall sin, shall be reprobates, shall never repent, and shall be damned to all eternity for the sins that God has decreed them to commit?

Do you preach that the will of the reprobate is so pressed by motives that he must choose reprobacy, without any "power to the contrary," so that he is as necessarily damned as he was necessarily born?

If you do not preach all this and more, with the full purpose that the people shall completely understand it, then you do not declare the whole counsel of God according to Calvinism. You delusively play Hamlet *minus* Hamlet.

statement and definition rather than in substance. For it is surprising how nearly Scripture-loving men do come together, when each has so defined his position that the other understands exactly what his brother disputant means.

We shall also read these views of the venerated Princeton divine well knowing that he will hold that our Calvinism *ought* to bring us to his conclusions on the topics where we differ; but no man understands better than Dr. Hodge that it is unwarrantable to impute to an antagonist all the consequences of his views as seen from our stand-point, or even as actually deduced.

But having said thus, we do not risk much in predicting that when time has been given for the reviewers to speak, there will be no general nor authoritative dissent from the Calvinism of the Soteriology of Dr. Hodge among the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, Old School or New. This may be asserted with even less qualification than that which we made in respect to the forms of statement of Augustine and Calvin and our own Confession.

If this prove true, it is an instructive fact. Does this indicate the elimination of the Augustinian theology? Does this look like laying Calvin's Institutes in the grave of quiet neglect, as something which the growing centuries have passed beyond? Let it be remembered just here, that by the author of these volumes there have been theologically trained a larger number of Presbyterian ministers than by any other living man, or perhaps any two or three. Whatever may be our individual preferences, the theology therein taught pervades our Church. The Augustinian theology, in its stricter forms, is seated in the chairs of many of our theological seminaries; perhaps it might be said, more even of its philosophy is there than for some past years.*

With regard to the averment that our Calvinism is the same that it has been, and with no wider difference in less essential points and modes of statement than has existed for many years, let me direct the attention of the reader to the comments of Albert Barnes on the famous ninth chapter of Romans, which has always been regarded by Calvinists as their impregnable

* We again call to mind that the question is not, What is taught in chairs and tomes, but, *What is heard in the pews?*

stronghold. Mr. Barnes was always and every-where known as an advanced New School theologian. No man was ever more fair-minded, or more open to all genial liberalizing influences from sister denominations and from the age he lived in and for which he did so much. No man more distinctly represented the theology of a certain portion of the Presbyterian Church than Mr. Barnes; yet the reader of his commentary on the chapter referred to will find as clear an enunciation of the doctrines of predestination and election as in the volumes that come from Princeton. What Dr. Hodge teaches in a more scholastic way, Mr. Barnes, having a different audience to address, teaches in a familiar way. But the teaching is the same.

The copy of Barnes on Romans which is before me bears the imprint of 1842, thirty years ago, but it expresses unchanged the views of the very same class of men who form today no uninfluential portion of the Presbyterian Church. Now when it is remembered that the Commentaries of Barnes have a wider circulation than any other similar publication of our own and perhaps of any age—having run up into the millions —that they have not been superseded, for their special purpose, by any later ones, and that they are in the hands of hundreds of thousands of laymen, parents, Sunday-school teachers, and others, and that he is avowedly and consistently Calvinistic, it may not be altogether correct to say that Calvinism is "eliminated" from the land, nor that "the general religious consciousness of the country recognizes it as effete." *

As we pass on to some further proofs of our position, the readers of this article will pardon the author of it if he indulges in a familiar way of illustration which may fortify the main argument.

The name of Dr. Hodge suggests, in connection with our topic, some famous theological conflicts now of the former

*We had always supposed that Albert Barnes' Calvinism was so Arminian that he was put to judicial trial for heresy; that he had to modify his Commentary to meet Calvinistic demands. The volume of the "Presbyterian Board of Publication," entitled "Old and New," handles him severely as Arminian. Mr. Barnes' Commentary has been widely circulated among Methodists by Methodist ministers under the idea that his Calvinism was so thin and so occultly diffused as to be imperceptible to our people. Certainly the expression of his Calvinism, although it does exist, by no means compares in explicitness with that of Dr. Hodge. Had it been so, its popularity would scarce have existed even with Calvinistic Churches: certainly it would never have circulated, as too widely it has, among Methodists.

generation. He has been in the high places of the field. Somewhere he playfully alludes to his doctrinal castle as an Ehrenbreitstein from which he fears no dislodgment.* I think the word fell out in a light skirmish which he had with Professor Park about the Theology of the Intellect and the Feelings; but it is many years since I read of the fray, though I did read both sides with interest.

From this citadel the good and great Professor has again and again led out the Old School hosts to battle. In one or two of these theologic onsets I felt a special interest. The review of "Beman on the Atonement" was in my possession, when in my early ministry I was assistant pastor with Dr. Beman in the old First Church of Troy. It had been issued several years, and yet the Doctor had not seen it until I put it in his hands. It can hardly be called a gentle review. Indeed, theologic combats are not often what pleasant Sir Walter calls the tournament of Ashby de la Zouch—"The gentle and free passage of arms." But Beman was an old warrior, used to rough intellectual bouts, and as he read the pamphlet he would shake it in his lifted hand and thrust out a terse argument or indignant remonstrance, much to my interest and amusement. I seem to see him now—but the old chiefs are nearly gone! What led me to recall the incident was the undoubted fact that Dr. Beman was always regarded as standing on the outmost verge of the New School ranks, and yet there was no firmer Calvinist in the Presbyterian Church than he. At one time he had a sort of Theological Institute of his own, where he taught the Governmental theory of the Atonement, and cognate views of divine justice, which were any thing but orthodox in the eyes of Princeton; but he was a bold asserter of the Calvinistic points, and preached them unhesitatingly from his pulpit. There are not a few who hold his views at the present time, who have yet to learn that Calvinism has

* His Tolbooth, we should rather say. Dr. Hodge's system is, indeed, the most unflinching fatalism—and so the most consistent Calvinism—we know at the present day. Yet whether even he can squarely avow Infant Damnation with Calvin, Edwards, and the Articles of the Presbyterian Church, we are uninformed. From this, as a persistent logician, as we have already shown, he ought not to shrink. God might as justly reprobate a helpless infant as reprobate a man before he was an infant, and eternally before he was born. Either would be damning a human being for what he could not help.

dropped out of their belief, or has become effete in their ministrations.*

Another of the encounters in which the Princeton professor was engaged was memorable in its day, and is also instructive in this connection. It is yet famous in the regions of my old Alma Mater in New Haven. Although before my day, yet a somewhat intimate association with Doctors Taylor and Fitch on the one hand, and some dear Princeton friends on the other, led me to read both sides of the able and memorable discussion between the New Haven and the Princeton divines.

Those, if there be any, who suppose that discussion to have had reference to the doctrines of Foreordination and Election are altogether mistaken.† These may have been involved as

*Precisely what Dr. Beman preached regarding Predestination thirty or forty years ago is hardly relevant to the present question. If he agreed with Taylor, Fitch, and Finney, he did endeavor to amalgamate a large amount of Arminianism with his Calvinism.

† We think Dr. Aikman would do well to reconsider, also, this statement. Somewhere about the year 1830 Dr. Wilbur Fisk, subsequently President of the Wesleyan University, published a sermon of rare compactness and power on Predestination. Dr. Fisk was born in New England, was educated among Calvinists, graduated at a Calvinistic University, and was a thorough master of both Calvinistic and Methodistic theology. His sermon raised an excitement in Calvinistic ranks, was reviewed by seven or eight periodicals, and among others by Dr. Fitch, co-leader with Dr. Taylor of New Haven divinity, in an extended article of forty-seven pages in the "Christian Spectator," at New Haven, the then organ of the New Divinity. In that review Professor Fitch professes to state two views of predestination: namely, the Old School Calvinistic view, *against which he affirmed that Dr. Fisk's argument was conclusive and unanswerable*, and his own view, which he expounded, and maintained to be untouched by Dr. Fisk's logic; and he faulted Dr. Fisk for not duly making the distinction between the two. Dr. Fisk replied that the faulting was unjustifiable, for he had *never before heard that the first was not the true and only Calvinistic view* extant, and that the second, which Dr. Fitch claimed to be both Calvinistic and his own, was not Calvinistic but Arminian, and was essentially the view of his sermon, held from his youth up, and learned from the old standards of Methodism. Said Dr. Fisk, in a subsequent chapter of his Calvinistic Controversy: "If these gentlemen should ask me why I published my sermon in terms that included Calvinists generally, without making the exception in their favor, I answer, 1. The views of Dr. Taylor and 'those who believe with him,' on this particular point, were unknown to me at the time. Nor is this strange, for it is but lately that those views have been fully developed—never so fully before, probably, as in Dr. Fitch's review of my sermon, already alluded to. 2. It never occurred to me that any man or any set of men holding, in respect to predestination, the doctrine of James Arminius, John Wesley, and the whole body of Methodists, would call themselves Calvinists! This is all the apology I have, and whether or not it is sufficient the public must judge."—P. 103. To this Dr. Fitch

collateral points, as side issues, as relating to the bearings and consequences of the truths in debate, but the truths debated were, Our Connection with Adam, the Nature of Sin, Human Ability. Princeton pretty plainly alleged that New Haven had forsaken the Calvinistic fathers as respects

ingeniously but not ingenuously replied, that he was glad that *he had so presented Calvinism that Dr. Fisk was constrained to accept it.* Of course, with those who read Dr. Fitch's story alone, that gentleman got the credit of compelling Dr. Fisk to accept Calvinism! With Methodists it gained Dr. Fitch any thing but respect. For that, however, Dr. Fitch had no need to entertain any concern, as Methodist opinions were not his object. His object was to encompass a large segment of Arminianism into the "New Divinity," and yet label the whole incongruous lump "Calvinism." And what method so felicitous as to accomplish this in ostensibly defending Calvinism against the Arminians?

We have no copy at hand of Dr. Fitch's article, but the following is Dr. Fisk's view of its positions: "By God's foreordaining whatsoever comes to pass he (Dr. Fitch) only means that God foresaw that sin would certainly take place, and predetermined that he would not hinder it, either by refraining from creating moral agents, or by throwing a restraint upon them that would destroy their free agency. In short, that he would submit to it as an evil unavoidably incident to the best possible system, after doing all that he wisely could to prevent it! This is *foreordaining sin!* This is *predetermining* that it *should be!*"

The Presbyterian Board of Publication have published a book, by James Wood, D.D., on "Old and New Theology," from which we extract the following testimony:

"They (the positions assumed by Dr. Taylor and others) involve a denial of the divine decrees; for if God does not possess such absolute control over his creatures that he can govern them according to his pleasure, how could he have decreed any thing unconditionally concerning them, since it might happen that in the exercise of their free agency they would act contrary to the divine purpose? On the same principle they virtually reject the Calvinistic doctrine of election, and make election depend upon the foreknowledge of God and the will of the creature. This is actually the way in which Mr. Finney explains the doctrine. 'The elect, then,' says he, 'must be those whom God foresaw could be converted under the wisest administration of his government. That administering it in a way that would be most beneficial to all worlds, exerting such an amount of moral influence on every individual as would result, on the whole, in the greatest good to his divine kingdom, he foresaw that certain individuals could, with this wisest amount of moral influence, be reclaimed and sanctified, and for this reason they were chosen to eternal life. 'The elect were chosen to eternal life, because God foresaw that in the perfect exercise of their freedom they could be induced to repent and embrace the Gospel.' Mr. Tyler, from whose sermon we have already quoted, gives the same explanation of this doctrine, or, in other words, virtually denies it. 'God foresees,' he observes, 'whom he *can* make willing in the day of his power, and resolves that they shall be saved.' *Professor Fitch also advances the same idea in his review of Dr. Fisk's discourse* on Predestination and Election in the 'Christian Spectator.'"—Pp. 33–35.

Dr. Taylor's own language we shall soon quote. But perhaps we have said enough to suggest to Dr. Aikman a reconsideration of his statement.

these doctrines, but nothing was said about heresy in regard to the decrees.*

Just in this connection, and because the quotation in the "Methodist" from the "Independent" suggests the point, let me say that the term "Strict Calvinism" will bear defining when used in connection with Dr. N. W. Taylor, or other prominent New England divines of the later period.

The well-remembered controversy in the earlier part of this century, which lasted for twenty-five years, which had New Haven and East Windsor as its central points, and Dr. Taylor and Dr. Tyler as its leaders, which separated Nettleton from Taylor, and almost estranged them, did not mainly involve the special Calvinistic doctrines. These, indeed, came in for discussion; but the differences were principally with regard to Moral Agency, the Nature of Sin and Holiness, Regeneration, and Dr. Taylor's theory of the Foundation of Right. Dr. Tyler at a later day said, "The controversy was respecting the best mode of stating and defending the doctrines of Calvinism," which is perhaps the most correct and succinct description possible of the whole matter.† In a letter written by Nettleton from his death-bed, to Dr. Taylor, two days after a touching visit made by the latter to his dying brother, the great revivalist gives his final testimony against "some things published" by Dr. Taylor, "particularly on the subject of self-love, and the great doctrine of Regeneration."

Dr. Taylor had a great, perhaps an exaggerated, repugnance to be called after the name of any man; he never would have said "I am of Apollos." How "strict," however, his Calvinism was is very easily ascertained. Among the four volumes of his works is one on "Revealed Theology," with a brief Introduction by Dr. (now President) Noah Porter. It contains four sermons on Election and one on Perseverance. Dr.

* If this means that predestination was a subordinate and not a co-ordinate topic in the New Haven discussion, it needs, we think, a correction. On all these points the New Divinity was alike charged, and truly charged, with verging toward Arminianism, except upon those points where they overleaped Arminianism and vaulted into semi-Pelagianism.

† Not quite so. That was Dr. Fitch's *ruse*, as already said, which did not gain our respect. For we Methodists have self-conceit enough to believe that we know the difference between our Arminianism amalgamated with elements of Calvinism and a mere "mode of stating Calvinism."

Porter says: "These sermons were prepared with great care, after the author had been for many years a theological instructor, and were always read in the place of lectures to his students, it being a favorite opinion with him that no truth of the Scriptures could be exhibited with so much effect by the preacher, and that in no truth, when rightly exhibited, was the Gospel made so glorious as 'the power of God unto salvation.'"

The sermons on Election are worthy to be studied by men of all views as exhibitions of pulpit power; preached as Dr. Taylor preached them, they must have seemed great indeed, for I have heard him when I thought him unsurpassed in pulpit power by any man I ever heard. How far he was Calvinistic may be known when he defines the doctrine of Election in these words: "That God has eternally purposed to renew, and sanctify, and save a part only of mankind." "The orthodox doctrine is not an election to salvation, or a purpose of God to save on condition of repentance and faith, as unknown and uncertain events, as maintained by some Pelagian and Arminian writers." "The orthodox doctrine is not that God has purposed to save a part of mankind on condition of foreseen repentance and faith." If this is "modified Arminianism," * some of us would be happy to have it pervade all the

* Not having these sermons at hand, we are unable to say how far the passages quoted may be so environed by definitions and qualifications as to render them consistent with Dr. Taylor's Arminian views of election elsewhere expressed. Dr. Aikman must know, however, that Dr. Taylor was abundantly charged with inconsistencies and self-contradictions by his old school friends on this and other points. It is not wonderful if at times he felt it necessary to chalk up to genuine Calvinism, for if we rightly remember he was pledged by his professorial vows to defend Calvinism against all Arminianism, Pelagianism, Atheism, and other bad isms. There is no reason to doubt that Dr. Fitch's article, already adduced, was the expression of Dr. Taylor's views. Dr. Taylor's leading positions, that God always and in all cases prefers holiness to sin, that he secures holiness in men just so far as their unviolated free agency permits, certainly conditioned the sinner's election upon the choice of the man, and not, with Calvinism, solely on the arbitrary "good pleasure" of God. "Election," he said, "involves nothing more, as it respects his (the sinner's) individual case, except one fact—the *certainty to the divine mind* whether the sinner will yield to the means of grace, and voluntarily turn to God, or whether he will continue to harden his heart till the means of grace are withdrawn."—*Ch. Spectator*, 1831, p. 637. This contradicts the Calvinism of the above passages; bases God's decree on his foreknowledge; is modified Arminianism; is conformed to Dr. Taylor's usual theology; and we "would be happy to have it pervade all the pulpits of the" Presbyterian Church.

pulpits of the Methodist Episcopal Church; possibly we might in that case conclude that some other thing than Calvinism was "eliminated."

This doctrine Dr. Taylor *preached*, and he probably preached it as often as any man in New England, although it is well known that Mr. Nettleton was much in the habit of preaching, toward the close of a powerful revival of religion, on the subject of Election, and with great effect; and it is difficult to believe that there has ever been a preacher in this country who knew better how to adapt preaching to the purpose of leading men to Christ than Asahel Nettleton.*

May I introduce here a personal reminiscence? I once carefully prepared and preached to my people a sermon on Romans ix, 18: "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." The doctrine taught was, Not that God puts forth a positive efficiency to harden the heart of a sinner, which is simply inconceivable, and, as President Edwards says, would make God the immediate author of sin, but that God may place a sinner in circumstances where his heart will be hardened by the abuse of the very mercies freely extended unto him, and that God may at any moment, and to whom he will, shut down the gates of mercy forever. A few hours after its delivery a husband and wife called on me asking the jailer's great question. They said the sermon had made them fear lest if they did not flee to Jesus at once, God might see fit to harden them as he had hardened Pharaoh. It was the impression which the discourse was prayerfully designed to produce. They became believers, and are still members of the Christian Church. Some time after, I preached the same discourse in a New England Congregational pulpit, the pastor being present. At the close, one of the deacons, an Arminian in sentiment, said to his pastor with

* We could cheerfully indorse the high eulogy both of Dr. Taylor (on a former page) and of Dr. Nettleton, but not such eulogy as to sweep down all others in comparison. We have several times heard Dr. Taylor, and have had his sermons on our shelf, but were by no means impressed with his eminence as a preacher. And it may be modestly imagined that a Church that has spread as rapidly as Methodism, has been favored with evangelists quite equal in a preaching adapted to conversion to the sainted Nettleton. We think we could name many. However, Dr. Aikman's language probably intends to sweep within the horizon of his own denomination, though we think a careful modesty should say so.

a spice of displeasure, "What is the good of preaching such doctrine as that?" The reply of the pastor was, "Well, what is the good of having such doctrine in the Bible?" The point of the story is, that this pastor is a disciple of Dr. Taylor, and thoroughly at one with him in his theological beliefs. The author of this article has no right to speak for New Haven, having had his theological training in New York under the late Dr. White; but he presumes that Dr. Leonard Bacon would give an easy answer to the question whether the theologians in and near New Haven who have outlived their great teacher and logician either fear to preach on the themes which he deemed so practical, or preach them in a way which might be called a "modified Arminianism." *

Of the assertion that "Calvinism, whether Supralapsarian or Sublapsarian, is now seldom uttered in American pulpits, and that the general religious consciousness of the country recognizes it as effete," this may be said: That the decrees of God need not and ought not to form the common or frequent topics of preaching, while yet they may form, as we believe they do, the solid basis of the whole system of eternal Gospel truth and grace. The decrees of God are the independent determinations of the divine mind. Why should they, how can they, form the constant, or even frequent, topics of a Gospel pulpit, whose mission it is to be occupied with the direct overtures of God in Christ to a sinful and blood-purchased world; although, seeing that these overtures involve the severity, as well as the goodness, of God, they may have their solemn and appropriate place, to know which is the part of ministerial wisdom and responsibility. So far as my observation extends, Calvinists have not greatly erred in this regard. I very well know some who in my judgment make these special points too prominent. No one doubts the Calvinism of Jonathan Edwards. He was at times an awful preacher. Few men would now choose to use some of his language; not every man would have courage so to do even if he believed as Edwards did. But of the half hundred sermons of

* We are under no necessity of obtruding any inquiries upon Dr. Bacon. We very well know what Drs. Fitch and Taylor taught in regard to predestination; and if the present New Haven Congregational divines preach conformably thereto, we cheerfully commend their Gospel as that much non-Calvinistic and as "modified Arminianism." Does Dr. Aikman esteem our commendation as a condemnation?

his that have come down to us, how many are there which, so far as their Calvinism is concerned, could not have been preached from an Arminian pulpit? Not more than one; and many an Arminian will not much object to that—his sermon on Divine Sovereignty.

Those who choose to make themselves familiar with the sermons of President Davies, published in three closely-printed volumes, and among the most powerful ever preached in America, will find the same to be true of that great preacher, firm Calvinist as he was.

The truth is, there is much misconception as to the prominence given in ordinary pulpit ministrations to the doctrine of election. In this respect the Calvinistic pulpits of this day do not differ much from those of half a century ago, and probably we might with truth go much further back than that.* There is not so much difference in this respect as there is in both Arminian and Calvinistic pulpits in the frequency with which the doctrine of eternal punishment is now preached as compared with former times.

In drawing this article to a close let me in all fraternal kindness say, that many of us Calvinists feel that one of the chief things our Arminian brethren need to do for us is to understand us better, both as to our doctrines and our position. The editorial, found in such a quarter, seems, not to the writer alone, but to every Calvinistic friend to whom he has shown it, layman as well as clergyman, to be the most striking proof of this which any of us have lately met.† Many years ago, in a

* On this subject the "Presbyterian Board of Publication" says: "A half century ago it was sufficient to know that a man was a Presbyterian minister, in order to feel assured that he was sound in the faith according to the Calvinistic sense of this phrase. But for ten years previous to 1837 this test was quite insufficient. Under the Presbyterian name, and with Presbyterian credentials, ministers passed from congregation to congregation in certain parts of our country, and promulgated Arminian, and even Pelagian, tenets. . . . But in 1835 (the Old School being in the majority) the Assembly decided that 'it is the right of every Presbytery to be entirely satisfied of the soundness in the faith of those ministers who apply to be admitted into the Presbytery as members.' This was a *partial* remedy of the evil; but our former unity of sentiment was not restored until the separate organization of the New School body."—*Old and New Theology*, pp. 279, 280. This testimony confesses that New School Presbyterianism, and implies that Congregationalism were too much Arminianized for their fellowship.

† We can parallel it only by a passage in a letter from Dr. Porter, of Andover Seminary, to Dr. Beecher, published during the New Divinity controversy, in these

book store, I casually took up a volume, whose author and whose subject I have quite forgotten, but this sentence from it comes to my memory: "The two extremes of unconditional salvation, Calvinism and Universalism." Now the decrees of God are unconditional as being the self-originated, independent purposes of the divine mind, but the salvation which is decreed is a salvation whose conditions are faith, repentance, and love. Of course I do not impute such random writing as the above quotation to the men to whom I speak,* but still it may not be amiss to say that in all the world there are none who endeavor more fully to proclaim the conditions of salvation than we do; and in no pulpits is a Gospel preached whose terms are more free, whose grace is more available, and whose

words: "Arminianism received from the hand of Edwards its death-blow, of which it lingered more than half a century in New England, and died."

*Dr. Aikman here seems to be unaware of some of the positions of the elder Calvinism itself. One of its branches held that all decreed by the unconditional decree was itself unconditional. Faith and repentance were but a part of the salvation so decreed, and therefore were no conditions of it. Three of Mr. Wesley's publications were aimed against this truly logical view. Vol. VI, pp. 68–81, and 96–99. We can name an American Calvinist who declared that "there is not such a thing as a condition of salvation in the Bible." The writer here reprehended by Dr. Aikman well knew the Calvinism we *once* had to encounter. Calvinism has grown Arminian since, and adopted *in words* conditional salvation, universal atonement, free-will, infant salvation, and even "self-determining power." The Calvinism of sixty years ago largely repudiated them all.

Yet, on a former page, (page 313,) Dr. Aikman himself repudiates "conditional salvation"! He quotes two propositions from Dr. N. W. Taylor, in which that theologian denies that God does "save *on condition* of repentance and faith" either "as unknown and uncertain events," or "as foreseen." That is, there are no "conditional salvation," and no "conditions of salvation." Dr. Aikman earnestly applauds the enunciation of these propositions; he "would be happy to have it pervade all the pulpits of the Methodist Episcopal Church." And yet Dr. Aikman exultingly claims before this paragraph closes, "there are none who endeavor more fully to proclaim *the conditions of salvation* than we!"

Want of space prevents our demonstrating that Dr. Hodge's theology, so eulogized by Dr. Aikman, excludes "conditional salvation." Briefly we may indicate that Dr. Hodge enounces that the great distinctive between Calvinism and Arminianism is that the former makes God the author of our salvation, the latter man. Now Arminianism makes man the author of his own salvation only as performer of "conditions" by God prescribed. This Dr. Hodge clearly excludes. It may, therefore, be shown, with an adamantive logic, that the issue between us and Dr. Hodge is *the conditionality of salvation.* And here crops out the grand schism between the Calvinistic pulpits and the Calvinistic chairs; between the popular sermons and the standard tomes. But the real deeper issue is between the people and the theology; between the nineteenth century and Calvinism.

faith will more certainly secure salvation, than in the Calvinistic pulpits of America.*

Albert Barnes has somewhere said that some men are born Arminians and some men Calvinists. There is a great deal of

* And so, we doubt not, Dr. Aikman preaches, heartily, sincerely, and eloquently. But we deny his logical right as a Calvinist to do so. He has no right to exhort men to do otherwise than God has willed, decreed, and foreordained they shall do. He has no right to hold men guilty for fulfilling God's decree and will. He has no right to offer salvation to those whom God has eternally and unchangeably excluded from salvation. He has no right to exhort men to repent, who by volitional necessity cannot repent. He has no right to say "they can if they will," when he knows that, by the laws of psychological causation, they cannot will. It is sophistical for him to say "they can will if they *please*," when he knows they cannot "*please*." It is inhumane for him to tell "impenitent sinners" that it is just for them to be damned for their impenitence, when he knows that they are impenitent because God wills them to be impenitent. If God has decreed men's sins, what an awful sinner is Dr. Aikman, who stands up in the pulpit to oppose and defeat God's decrees! Surely, if God has decreed a thing, the thing is right! If the sinner is damned for fulfilling God's decrees, ought not the imaginary god to be damned, *à fortiori*, who makes such decrees? Is not the god a cruel hypocrite who would eternally by decree exclude a vast mass of mankind from salvation, and then mock them with the offer of salvation? And what a treacherous hypocrite is that god who, while proclaiming a public will that men should be holy and be saved, still maintains under cover "a secret will" that they should be wicked and damned! And how doubly a treacherous hypocrite must he be when, with regard to a large part of mankind, he takes care that his saving public will shall be defeated, and his damning "secret will" accomplished! How "is grace available" to the man who is decreed by God never to accept "that grace," and whose will is volitionally necessitated to reject that "grace?" What if "faith will secure salvation," if the power of faith does not exist and is withheld by God at his own good pleasure? We Arminians, on the contrary, preach a salvation free from all these clamps and fetters. We say to the sinner, "God now puts salvation at the decision of your own will; no decree forged in a back eternity determines how you shall choose; no dark reprobation has sealed your doom; no limitation fences up the atonement from any one of you; no volitional necessity determines your choice for sin." Now none of these broad and glorious announcements of a free salvation can the Calvinistic pulpit make without contradicting its creed. And it is doubtless the seeming freeness of the Calvinistic offers of salvation that makes the people say, "Calvinism is not preached now."

Let us suppose, what is no impossible case, that Dr. Aikman is called to preach somewhere to a congregation which, in secret fact, is composed entirely of Reprobates. *First*, God's foreordination fixing their every volition from the womb to the grave, and determining them to sin and death, has made them victims of hell and eternity before they were born, with no possibility of reversal; so that they are to be irrevocably damned for what they cannot help. *Second*, Born from Adam, for his sin they are also given over to irreversible spiritual impotency to repent; and so are again irrevocably damned for what they cannot help. *Third*, By God's will they are so placed under the influences of motives that they must

truth in the remark. Men are constitutionally disposed to certain beliefs as well as to certain forms. There were Calvinists before Calvin, and there were Arminians before Arminius. Augustine himself held the main position of the latter in his earlier days, although he afterward retracted it, and wrote with all his great power against it. We repeat, that neither will eliminate the other: "the thing that hath been, it is that which shall be." So let us be tolerant, and wisely

sin without any power of contrary choice;" so that they are thrice irrevocably damned for what they cannot help. Now can any one stand up and offer a free salvation to that poor company of Reprobates without a most flagrant falsehood? Is it not the very archfiend's mock to speak, as Dr. Aikman does above, of "terms free," "grace" available," "faith securing salvation," for this mass of pre-damned creatures? "Grace" for pre-doomed Reprobates for whom God's treacherous "secret will" never meant any "grace;" whom his foreordination has forever excluded from "grace;" whose depraved impotence by nature renders them incapable of accepting "grace," and whose wills are bound by causative necessity to reject "grace!" Were we one of these Reprobates (and we confess our moral feelings are entirely on their side) we should certainly beg Dr. Aikman, or any other preacher of "grace," to spare us such grim demoniac irony. It is bad enough to be damned, but it is worse to have the damnation aggravated by such tantalizing and insulting gospel. We should think, if one of the lot, that the last finishing drop in the cup of unjust damnation was a Calvinist's preaching to us a free salvation.

Yet we cheerfully trust that Dr. Aikman will not cease to obey the expansiveness of his own heart, and continue, unlimited by his narrow creed, to preach a broad and free salvation. It is by this, compelled by the example of Methodism, that the Calvinistic pulpit itself is "eliminating" Calvinism and rendering it "effete," and making the people say that no Calvinism is preached. Place before their eyes the Calvinistic creed, lying back of the pulpit, in the books and the schools, and they at once boastfully answer, "*Our* minister does not hold such doctrines; he preaches *a free salvation* just like the Methodists." And it is this very fact, of the preaching a free salvation, so freely confessed by Dr. Aikman, that bases and largely *justifies the statement of the Methodist.* This same fact also both explains the polemic *peace* we specified above, and furnishes the reason why Calvinism is not now so deleterious in this country as Methodism first found it to be. And this fact, too, is prophetic of the time when Calvinism shall be as fully eliminated from Christian theology as it was for the first three centuries of the Church. Methodism has demonstrated the utter non-necessity of Calvinism for either a deep Christian piety, or a sweeping Christian success. That understood, the preaching a free salvation will melt away the limitations of dogma, and fatalism will be relegated to the domains of philosophy. Predestination in theology is a surplusage and a superfluity. Banish that to the domains of metaphysics, and in theology and homiletics *we are at one.* And it is through this route we descry the future doctrinal oneness of the evangelic Church. The so-called Calvinistic pulpits are preaching away the Calvinistic creed. We Methodists stopped debate when we saw that they were so fully doing our work for us.

endeavor to understand each other. It ought not to seem reasonable that thousands of ordained ministers of Christ should profess a doctrine which they do not hold; or, with puny irresolution, should secretly hold a doctrine which the general religious consciousness of the country recognizes as effete.* No; let these two great phases of theologic thought live side by side, as they have done for ages, and let them live peacefully. In the wise consideration of each other's views we may both learn more than either now knows. We both have need to vail our faces before the greatness of God's ways. Perhaps our humility may be profitably directed earthward far enough to prevent either of us from towering so high in our denominational consciousness as to imagine that the other is submerged out of the sight of the world.

Art. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly. January, 1873. (Philadelphia.)—1. Position of the Baptists in the History of American Culture. 2. The Second Century: A Chapter in Church History. 3. Skepticism and Scholarship. 4. The Prayer Test. 5. Darwinism. 6. Paradise. 7. Death-Bed Repentance. 8. Baptism, a Positive Law.

Bibliotheca Sacra. January, 1873. (Andover.)—1. Christian Ernest Luthardt's Refutation of False Views as to the Design of St. John's Gospel. 2. The Diaconate. 3. The Chinese Language. 4. The Scriptural Doctrine of the Triumph of Christ's Kingdom distinguished from Millenarianism. 5. The Natural Basis of our Spiritual Language. 6. Paul's Panegyric of Love.—A New Critical Text, Translation, and Digest. 7. Unconscious Greek Prophecy. 8. The Purifying Messiah.—Interpretation of Isaiah lii, 15. 9. Contributions to History.

Christian Quarterly, January, 1873. (Cincinnati.)—1. Excommunication. 2. The Downfall of the Secular Papacy. 3. Popular Amusements as Seen Through the Law of Christ. 4. Church Organization *versus* Church Government. 5. Sunday-Schools, and their Importance in Missionary Work. 6. The Representative Character of Christ.

Mercersburg Review, January, 1873. (Philadelphia.)—1. Infidelity—Its Principles. 2. The Crisis in the Conflict between the Crescent and the Cross. 3. The Naturalness of Christianity. 4. The Mission of Philosophy. 5. Woman's Culture. 6. The Sunday-School Movement in its Relation to the Cause of Educational Religion. 7. Conscience and the Vatican. 8. Regeneration and Conversion. 9. The Forgiveness of Sin.

---

* Yet as an objective fact, repeating that we impugn not the *men*, we maintain that *this stupendous contradiction does exist.* It is because of its existence that we are an Arminian. An uneasy sense of that contradiction pervades the minds of our Calvinistic brethren, but is evaded under the plea of mystery, etc. On the other hand, *we* rest in the harmony of our creed, and desire for them the same happy position.

New Englander, and Congregational Review, January, 1873. (New Haven.)—1. Herbert Spencer's Laws of the Knowable. 2. In Memoriam. 3. August Comte and Positivism. 4. Prison Discipline as a Science. 5. Bushnell's Sermons on Living Subjects. 6. Casuistry. 7. Name-Words in the Vernacular. 8. American Landscape Painters. 9. The Treaty of Washington in 1871.

New England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal. January, 1873. (Boston.)—1. Memoir of the Hon. William Willis, LL.D. 2. Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Portsmouth, N. H. 3. Letters and Journal of Col. John May, of Boston. 4. Passages in the Life of Priscilla (Thomas) Hobart. 5. Rear-Admiral Nehemiah Bourne. 6. Family Record of John Appleton, born 1652. 7. Richard Cranch and his Family. 8. Samuel Johnson, D.D., of Connecticut. 9. Freeholders of Rowley, (Mass.,) 1677. 10. Graduates of Middlebury College who married in Middlebury, Vt. 11. Sable Island. 12. Witchcraft Papers. 13. Captain John Haskins' Company of Militia, 1773. 14. Petition of the Connecticut Soldiers in the Revolutionary Army to Governor Trumbull. 15. Inscriptions from Grave-stones in Seabrook, N. H. 16. Hampton Falls and the Rev. Paine Wingate. 17. Early Settlers of Stratford, Conn. 18. Letter-Missive from the Town of Canterbury, N. H., to the Fourth Church in Hampton, N. H. 19. Seals of the City of Richmond, Va., with Facsimiles of the same. 20. The Lippitt Family of Rhode Island. 21. The Plymouth Shermans. 22. The Crane Family. 23. The Hayes Family of Connecticut and New Jersey. 24. The Hutchinson and Sandford Families.

North American Review, January, 1873. (Boston.)—1. The Rise of Napoleonism. 2. Henry Flood, and the Condition of Ireland from Swift to O'Connell. 3. Capital and Labor. 4. Causes of the Commune. 5. Björnstjerne Björnson as a Dramatist. 6. The Rationale of the Opposition to Capital Punishment. 6. Mixed Populations of North Carolina.

Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review, January, 1873. (New York.)—1. Berkeley's Philosophy. 2. "The Dispensation of the Fullness of Times." 3. Woman's Place in Assemblies for Public Worship. 4. Dr. Dorner's System of Theology. 5. Catholic and Protestant Treatment of the Evidences. 6. Why Are Not More Persons Converted Under our Ministry? 7. Beneficiary Education for the Ministry. 8. Who was the Sister of our Lord's Mother? 9. The Presbytery of Wandsworth, erected in 1572. 10. Dr. Forbes on Romans *vs.* Dr. Hodge.

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, January, 1873. (Gettysburg.)—1. Feeling as Related to Faith. 2. The Millennial Era of the Christian Church. 3. The Church. 4. Professor Tyndall's Test of Prayer. 5. The Ministerium. 6. The Position in the Church of Baptized Non-Confirmed Members. 7. Popular Theaters Two Thousand Years Ago.

Theological Medium, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, January, 1873. (Nashville.)—1. The Importance of our Colleges to the Church. 2. The Moral Law. 3. The Transfiguration of Christ. 4. The Doctrine of Reprobation Defined and Explained. 5. The Age of the Patriarch Job—The Learning of his Times—His Typical Character. 6. Education our Country's Safety. 7. Japan. 8. Sunday-Schools, and their Importance in Missionary Work.

Southern Review, January, 1873. (Baltimore.)—1. The Present Crisis. 2. Solar Spots, Prominences, etc. 3. Paris and its People. 4. Smith's Blanchet's Legendre. 5. Armageddon. 6. Jesus of the Evangelists. 7. Oceanic Circulation. 8. Peggy O'Neal; or, The Doom of the Republic. 9. Poem.

With the exception of Brownson's Romanistic Quarterly Review, we know no Quarterly in the country but the Southern which can properly be called a *Politico-Ecclesiastical Quarterly Review.* Other professedly religious Quarterlies present, exceptionally, political articles; but none but the Southern has a regular staple department of trenchant, par-

tisan, and often violent manifestoes. What renders this fact specially noteworthy is the regular appearance on its cover of the notice, "PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH." This announcement is by authority, we suppose, of the General Conference of that Church, and under the supervision of the bishops. The review is authoritatively indorsed, particularly its political articles, in the weekly papers of that Church, and is pressingly recommended as a denominational Review to the patronage of its ministers and laity by the accomplished book-agent, Dr. Redford. Conferences pass resolutions indorsing the Quarterly by name; and a book noticed in our Book-Table, (p. 347,) entitled, or rather mistitled, THE M. E. CHURCHES NORTH AND SOUTH, written by one of its bishops, and published as an Article in this Review, is earnestly recommended for circulation in book form among their people. This politico-ecclesiastical Quarterly is, therefore, the highest organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It speaks for that Church to the world. It speaks for that Church to that Church. It indoctrinates its people, is accepted both by ministry and people; and while it thus secures the unanimity of that Church, it tells the world what the unanimity of that Church declares. What this Southern Review, in its regular departments, fully and uncontradictedly says, the Southern Methodist Church says. And what this Review, regularly and unchangingly, is, namely, ecclesiastico-political, *that the Southern Methodist Church is, ecclesiastico-political.*

We may, therefore, properly style this Quarterly the

POLITICAL ORGAN OF A PROFESSEDLY NON-POLITICAL CHURCH.

Since this Review, therefore, creates and expounds the politics of the Southern Church, it is of some consequence to know what its politics are: that is, what are the politics of Southern politico-ecclesiastical Methodism. We may, therefore, reply, authorized by its manifestoes through this Quarterly, that they are very extreme. They are to the fullest extent DENATIONALIZING. They are more extreme than the reveries of John C. Calhoun himself. Mr. Calhoun taught the doctrine that any State has the right to *nullify* any law of Congress, yet remain in the Union. This Review teaches

that any State may, by a mere act of legislation, rightfully *secede* from the Union. To many this difference, namely, between *nullification* and *secession*, may seem unimportant—the two being respectively but the tweedle*dum* and tweedle*dee* of treason. But there seems to be this difference, that Mr. Calhoun destroys the Constitution by simply reducing us back to the condition of the old Confederacy, while this Review's theory—the theory of Southern Methodism—would legitimately, and in strict accordance with the Constitution, split us into thirty or sixty independent, and at any moment hostile, nations. We are no longer a NATION, but an agglomeration; we have not a Constitution, but a league of associate *natiunculæ*. This may be properly called ultra-Calhounism; meaning thereby something a little beyond the nullification doctrine of John C. Calhoun. And if our late war was, on the part of our Government, constitutional and right, then this doctrine is treason in theory, just as the war by the South was treason in practice.

To discuss these *phantasmata politica* is not our present purpose. Ours is not, like the Southern Review, a *political* Quarterly. We were taught by our political parentage that we had a country larger than one particular State; we never dreamed that seriously this New Jersey, where we write, was a nation; and, even in spite of the Lynch judiciary at the South, we have ever imagined that, whether in Maine or Texas, we were, *de jure*, in "mine own nation." We have not imagined, heretofore, that the holding such views was "politics." Among our first notice that it is so considered by any body was the seeing "loyalty" ridiculed by a Southern bishop, in the columns of a Southern paper, as politico-ecclesiasticism. Our present purpose, however, is to call attention to the fact that ultra-Calhounism, *denationalization*, is the politics of this Review, ably, bitterly, and persistently maintained, "*under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South;*" that all the authorities of that Church—bishops, conferences, and editors—press them upon that Church, and, as far as in them lies, shut their Church up tight to ultra-Calhounism; so that, in all probability, its rank and file are thereby compacted solidly into a partisan political society. Knowing with what fixed habit the Southern people, trained under the baton of the slave-holding oligarchy, follow their leaders, we see no reason

to doubt that that Church is a compact instrument in the hands of its politico-ecclsiastical oligarchy, ready for a secessional political leadership to become a military leadership so soon as any hope of success shall dawn. We have watched with painful interest the growth of things into this shape. The arrangement was completed when, Dr. Bledsoe (who was Secretary of War under Jefferson Davis) having been installed head-editor in the Church, full berth was given to his political indoctrinations in the head-periodical of the Church. From that moment the ultra-Calhounite political flag floated at their mast-head, and Southron Methodism became a political Church.

Meanwhile attention is skillfully diverted from these movements by raising a continual cry of "politics" against our own non-sectional Church. The innocents among their people are made to believe, for instance, that Bishop Simpson holds the politics of our seventy-four conferences between his thumb and finger. The letter-writers who fabricate these thriftless statements are not for one moment to be suspected of the idiocy of believing their own mendacities. No one can live long here at the North without knowing that individualism, independence of leaderships, under free access to all sorts of information, is our predominant characteristic. A bishop in our nation-wide Church, while justly empowered in his legitimate sphere, is not the wide lord-paramount that a bishop in the sectional Methodism is. One of our bishops may, indeed, be personally influential with two or more successive Presidents; but that gives him not the slightest control over the political opinions of our ministry or people. Bishop Simpson exercises just as little influence on our politics as our Democratic friend, Dr. Carlton. While we have flaunted no garish professions of non-politicalism, have made up no sanctimonious non-political faces, have spontaneously uttered our moral convictions without particularly caring whether they wound into political complications or not, we are wholly ungoverned by any political partisanship. A party gains or loses with us just so far as it presents more or less of holy moral principle in its doctrines and practices. To the *principles*, whether there be party or not, we owe all our allegiance; to party, as such, none. We have no political organ for our Church. There are more unequivocal, non-moral, partisan politics in one number of this

Southern Review than in the entire body of our own periodical literature since the war. So far as we know, politics form no regular or usual part of our discussions in conferences, bishops' cabinets, churches, sermons, preachers' meetings, or periodicals. There are no political mutual understandings. Political opinions are not taken into account in our ecclesiastical elections. Every man believes and says just what he pleases. It is true that at the present time, from great controlling and moral reasons, the great body of moral and educated native American Protestants in the North have spontaneously come to very near a political unanimity. You may generally assume that a man who is no rum-seller, no haunter of lager or whisky saloons, no anti-Sabbatist, no Romanist, no professional politician, but a moral, conscientious native American, belongs to the same party as comprises the large majority of our Methodists. But that any ecclesiastical efforts are exerted in order to control political opinions, (apart from purely and *bona fide* ethical questions,) is a falsehood which nothing but a determinate purpose of falsehood has created in the mind of the Southern Church. That system of political dictation exists in the Southern Church *only*, with the bishops at its head, and this Southern Review for its instrument. And we say, with all sincerity and solemnity, it is a fact fraught with danger for their future. The principles of denationalization inculcated upon that Church by their highest Churchly authority, interspersed amid doctrines of religion, and gradually blended with the most sacred feelings in the hearts of their people, are sowing wind to reap whirlwind. We beseech these politico-ecclesiastical leaders to pause and entertain the question, whether the most disastrous results may not follow their thus keeping constantly present to the thoughts of their people the ideas of disunion, disintegration, and hatred to other sections of our country—fringing their clouds with the fiery linings of a possible war in the future. The danger is not to us, but to themselves. Never were the principles of nationalism more firmly fixed than now. The nationalistic sections of our country are broadening and strengthening, and reducing the old "South" to an insignificant corner. For these unhappy men, then, to sow their little section with secessionism, is to plan for a future rebellion; and they may well query whether, after

such a second movement, Thaddeus Stevens would not dictate the terms of reconstruction from his grave.

How far our representatious are accurate let the following extracts, which are but average specimens of the political drift of the *Southern Review*, show:

THEORY OF SECESSION.—"The doctrine of Secession is this: If States are united by a compact, and if, as in the case of the Constitution of the United States, the compact assigns no term or period for its continuance, then it binds them only during their good-will and pleasure. Then may any State, with or *without cause*, secede therefrom without a breach or violation of the constitutional compact. . . . *No cause whatever is necessary to justify, as to the Constitution, the exercise of the right of Secession. Such is the fullness and the freedom and the glory of the right of Secession, properly understood.*"—*Southern Review*, July, 1872, page 133.

"(1.) Here, then, was the *first* great principle which divided the two antagonistic parties in the United States—the *sovereignty of the States.* (2.) The second was a legitimate corrollary from this first principle. If the States are sovereign parties to the Constitution, they must have a right to judge of it. The Constitution is their compact. A compact must have parties to it, and these parties must have the right to judge of its enforcement, and (if the other parties are faithless to its obligations) to withdraw from it. All this is swept away if the States are *not* sovereign, and the Government of the United States, not being their agent, and not responsible to them, may do as it pleases without any check from their authority."—October, 1871, page 785.

MR. LINCOLN A PERJURER AND TRAITOR.—"Mr. Lincoln exercised this power, knowing it to be unconstitutional—utterly so. Every one of the half dozen proclamations which he issued, inaugurating the war, was clearly an unconstitutional proceeding. That he was prompted to issue them, as Mr. Stephens informs us, and as every one knows was the case, by mischievous counselors, does not justify the Executive in violating his oath to protect, maintain, and defend the Constitution. He called out troops, placed the Southern States under blockade, and commenced the war without a tittle of right or authority

to do so; and, after having directly violated the Constitution by these several acts of usurpation, asked Congress, on its assembling, to indorse his measures as constitutional. That body very properly refused to do so. How could it make acts constitutional which, both in letter and spirit, were contrary to the Constitution? The thing was equally absurd and impossible. Mr. Douglas, in the extra session of the Senate that met before both Houses convened, having heard it intimated that Mr. Lincoln intended to resort to war measures against the South by blockading its ports, declared, in his place, that the proceeding, if attempted, would be as unconstitutional as it was preposterous and suicidal—that the President could not, without usurpation, exercise any such power. Notwithstanding this announcement coming from a distinguished member of the Senate, and, *ex officio*, a constitutional adviser of the President, the latter did issue one proclamation after another blockading the ports of the Southern States, thus virtually declaring war against them and against their sovereignty, which act, when consummated, became an act of treason against the States, of which the offensive character was not diminished, but increased, by the pretense that he acted in his capacity of Executive of the Federal Union."—October, 1872, pp. 440, 441.

"CUT-THROATS, TYRANTS, AND USURPERS."—"Had the Southern States declared war against the federal body? No! They had only seceded from it, which, as distinct sovereignties, they had a perfect right to do, when they found themselves aggrieved by its action. As Mr. Lincoln could not call this proceeding treason, and hang the States that resorted to it as their remedy against an infringement of their constitutional rights, he called it an 'insurrection,'—'a formidable insurrection in certain States of the Union, which had arrayed itself in armed hostility to the Government of the United States, constitutionally administered.' Was this true? No! The statement was utterly false in every particular. There was no insurrection at the time 'in certain States of the Union'—none whatever. If the people had arms in their hands, (and they generally carried them in those days of peril,) it was not to assail a Government constitutionally administered, but to maintain their rights and liberties against the insidious or overt acts of cut-throats, tyrants, and usurpers."—October, 1872, page 441.

A FUTURE WAR.—"Secession, it is true, is not the issue of the day, *but it may become some day the issue of a down-trodden, insulted people*, not crippled by war, who have the ability to maintain their position. It is not the remedy for the political grievances of the Southern States only, but the remedy of all the States of the Union for the moral corruption pervading the entire body politic, arising from the falsehood, treachery, perjury, and recklessness of utterly unprincipled rulers. These are pestilent mischiefs, which sometimes undermine, and ultimately effect the ruin of, the best organized Governments, and reflect dishonor on the very name of liberty. The States should never abandon as worthless the remedy for them which they have in their own hands."—October, 1872, page 463.

"It is the abuse of delegated, or the assumption of undelegated, power by faithless, incompetent, unprincipled men, intrusted with the administration of affairs, which has now brought the Federal Union to the very brink of ruin; and it is only, Mr. Stephens thinks, by thrusting these officials from the high places which they have long occupied and dishonored, that we can hope for any real restoration of the Union to its original integrity, and be *assured of its continuance for any great length of time to come.*"—October, 1872, page 473.

HOPES BEFORE THE LAST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.—"A favorable opportunity, it is believed, approaches for effecting this highly desirable result. If the people, throughout all the States, at the presidential election now near at hand, rising in their strength, shall lay their hands on those great political offenders who have violated their oaths and grossly abused the trusts committed to them, and, hurling them from their places without any particular ceremony, shall elect in their stead real statesmen, who will honestly and faithfully discharge their whole duty to the country and the Constitution, the latter may still be maintained in its original purity, and the Union be preserved. But if they fail to do this, and the same misgovernment, usurpation, inhumanity, tyranny, and injustice continue to mark the administration of Federal affairs which have disfigured it during the last decade, in such case *nothing, we apprehend, can prevent the*

dismemberment and overthrow, at no distant date, of the American Union of States, and, along with it, the downfall of the first great experiment of political self-government in the New World."—October, 1872, page 474.

DOGGEREL ON PRESIDENT GRANT.

"Where shone a Washington,
Begrimed with smoke, sits Jesse's puffing son,
The cloud-compelling deity, who rules
His piebald worshipers of knaves and fools;
A thing of accident, a bladder blown
By favoring fortune, and her special own;
Boorish in manners, poor in thought and speech,
His pen and tongue below the critic's reach;
Stupid and stubborn, scorning all advice,
And selling office for the highest price;
Saving provision for his last of kin,
Who, out of place and pocket, must go in;
Gambler in gold and stocks by go-betweens;
A pleasure-seeker upon others' means:
A brazen beggar, with an outstretched hand,
Ready for houses, horses, dogs, and land;
Nothing amiss to his unquenched desires,
Little or big alike his greed inspires:
A cottage here, a broad plantation there,
Down to a tavern bill or railroad fare.
Dull to his country's honor or her shame,
Indifferent to her interests or her fame,
So he can drive and drink and smoke the same!
No loafer need despair, nor satire want
A fitting subject, while there lives a Grant."

—October, 1871, page 949.

Thus far our extracts have traced the real politico-ecclesiastical portraiture which the Church South has given of herself in her Quarterly. We will now give her fancy picture of herself in her non-political attire, with its twin caricature of the "Church North" as a political Church. Not having the Quarterly containing these passages, we extract them from the republication in book form for popular circulation, as noticed at page 347.

NON-POLITICAL CHASTITY OF THE CHURCH SOUTH.—"It is a matter of devout gratitude to the Head of the Church that he has preserved one large body of the Methodist people of this country from political contamination. Even in the utmost stress of temptation during the war she kept herself, as a Church, unspotted from the world. Individual instances, no doubt, there were, but they were few, of the Southern preach-

ers becoming unduly active in public affairs in connection with the events which immediately preceded the war. But the history of her conference sessions is without a spot, and her pulpit, considering the nature and fury of the uproar in the midst of which it stood, preserved its poise in the most remarkable manner."—*M. E. Churches, North and South*, page 42.

POLITICAL "DEBAUCHERY" OF THE "CHURCH NORTH."—"Apologists plead, This Church surely is not wholly or very deeply debauched. . . . The conscience of the Northern people was sensitive on the subject of slavery, and now that it is out of the way it is not likely that any thing else will arise to complicate the Christian conscience with politics. This is very amiable and easy-going talk, but it proceeds upon a most superficial view of the facts. This Church has acquired a *political habit*, which is the growth of more than a quarter of a century. . . . The negro-equality question, the labor question, the Mormon question, the liquor-law question, and many others, on grounds true or fallacious, will appeal to the Christian conscience at the polls."—Pp. 51, 52.

"No fact of American history is more patent than that it is the habit of the Methodist Episcopal Church to invade the domain of the State—to run into politics. It feels itself charged with the management of State affairs in important cases.

"To make the matter worse, she has a political history that she is proud of. The people, and especially the preachers of this Church, feel that, as a Church, they have done more to bring about the present condition of things in the country than any other class of people. They review their career as political agitators with the utmost complacency. It has been successful. It has been brilliant. Not only in politics, but in war, they have run a triumphant course. It is a heroic history. They look upon themselves as having "saved the country." They carry with them the consciousness of the conqueror and the benefactor—all the result of the part they took in the politics of the country.

"So far as the past and the present can possibly give assurance of the future, it is certain that on all occasions that offer an issue, in which the Methodist conscience may deem itself concerned, the ecclesiastics of the Northern Church will be ready to go headlong into the canvass. She will be ever and

anon upon the hustings. Her pulpit will again resound with the declamation of the demagogue, and her pews will send back the loud huzza. . . .

"The Romish Church has always been unscrupulous in its methods. It will advance itself by political or any other means available. It is by no means impossible that, in coming political complications, there may be a time when Romanism will hold the balance of power. The example of ecclesiastical interference in the affairs of government has already been set. The public mind has been familiarized with it. *The Methodist Church North has pioneered the way for the Romanist, and when his opportunity arrives he will not be slow to follow.* . . .

"The country will need the Southern Church, then—a Church whose history is a history of devotion to Christ, and whose habit is that of undivided consecration to the work of God. God's battles are to be fought with the sword of the Spirit, by witnessing for him in prayer, and faith, and suffering. He has reserved to himself a Methodist Church in this country against the time of trial. When Apocalyptic portents shall shadow and darken the land, let us pray that he may have one Church, at least—and let us trust that he may have more than one—that shall have kept unspotted garments, and have no part nor lot with Babylon.

"This non-political character of the Church South, as distinguished from the Church North, is, as we conceive, *the most vital point of difference between the two bodies.*"—Pp. 58–63.

In these extracts we have given the contrasted self-drawn pictures of the Southern Church as she is, and the Southern Church as she pretends to be. She is judged from her own mouth.

A few words will trace the consistency of the entire course of our Quarterly in regard to the Church South, even in our changes. Immediately after the war and the re-establishment of the weeklies of the Church South, we discovered in their columns a spirit of repentance, of conciliation and reunion, that inspired a just hope that, immediately appreciated and accepted, it might lead to early unification in Church as well as in State. As none of our then officials seemed to notice these noble expressions of the right feeling, or to know of their existence, we made extensive extracts from the Southern papers

and spread them upon the pages of our Quarterly; adding and maintaining, with what powers we possessed, the inference that, such being their feeling, the fraternal right hand should, with full purpose of heart, be proffered them. We never offered to sacrifice a single principle. Our proposal was that *North and South should shake hands over the grave of buried slavery; that both sides should heartily co-operate in educating the colored race, and bring it to a capacity for properly exercising the duties of freemen; that such unification of the Churches, on a basis of perfect equality, should take place as would leave the present Church South Conferences entirely uninvaded.* Our express preference was that colored Methodism should have its own General Conference, in such fraternal relations with ours that aid could properly by us be furnished to it. Under such arrangements we held that there would be no need of organizing new conferences in the South, our only business there being provisional, in aiding and educating the freedmen whom a Northern fiat had emancipated and made us responsible for their well-being.

The Southern papers unanimously applauded our publication, and accepted for the time our terms. But in our own Church a most irrational opposition arose. We were assailed as having abandoned our principles, not only by some old antislavery friends, but by many who sought credit for a high antislaveryism which they had never displayed when antislaveryism cost any thing. Meanwhile, by the delay of this opposition, and the long friction of the debate, the temper of the South began to turn, and the golden hour was lost. The Southern rebel politicians, relieved by Government clemency from their first just fear, grew forthwith live and insolent, and breathed their Copperhead inspiration into a Church that was always proud to be a political appanage. Forthwith the Southern Methodist weeklies informed us that *their opinions in regard to slavery were unchanged.* Our offers of reunion were flouted. The teachers and missionaries going to the South were denounced. We were told that, as to our moneyed donations, the old slave-masters would be glad to take them, but they would thank the donors to keep at a distance. Meanwhile they have never established a colored school, or expressed a wish that one should be established. Their fixed purpose has been, as we

have repeatedly charged, that since individual slavery has been destroyed, collective *serfdom* shall take its place. Such is the inhumane, the unchristian, position of the Church South at this hour. Hence it hates all the proffers of conciliation or intercourse by our Church. It hates with a perfect hatred our presence on Southern soil. The Northern editor who most concurs in non-intercourse and widest separation is most heartily indorsed. With his editorials they shake hands, but they want to shake no hands with him. At every advance that has thus far been made they have responded with rejection on technical grounds, and usually with a paroxysm of insult and opprobrium, conceitedly exhibited through all their presses. So unanimous was this outburst of rage during and after the fraternal propositions of our Bishops at St. Louis that we made the following announcement in our Quarterly:

> Until a change for the better takes place, self-respect forbids our uttering a syllable further of either *reunion* or *fraternization*. Until that change, we dismiss both words from our vocabulary. For this permanence of the bitter and divisive spirit they, not we, are responsible, and boldly and intentionally responsible. If feud be ceaseless, and war return with returning Southern strength, the leaders of the Church South will bear a prime responsibility. Nor is there a doubt that the true sub-soil to all their hate is political. The Church South is being based on the old rebel stratum, is becoming intrenched in the old sectional prejudice that bred the war.—April, 1870.

All this is confirmed by the later developments. The bold proclamations by the Church South through its Quarterly of secessionism, this accusatory work of its bishops energetically scattered among its people, its persistent determination in favor of negro ignorance and serfdom, its angry sectionalism, all indicate that it has scarce abandoned the dream of future secession, and the restoration of slavery. Meanwhile, in the hot pursuit of sectionalism, Southern improvement is prevented. This Southern Quarterly never has an article on the development of Southern industrial resources. Northern capital is repelled and driven out. Immigration from any part of the world is virtually excluded, and vast areas of Southern land, among the most inviting of the earth, are nearly as closed to improvement as the wild hunting grounds of the western red men.*

* The following two items of a statistical summary of emigration for the past year we take from the "New York Times":

"*Fourth*—That by far the largest settlement of European immigrants outside the Metropolitan District of New York has taken place in the Middle, Western,

To us as a Church fraternization with the Church South is no advantage. The only inducements thereto are her good, the peace of the country, and the diminution of the scandal of a divided Methodism. Our first and most important business is to fill the South with our own true Methodism. That we must do, avoiding all injury to others, yet making no submissions. We have as much right on Southern soil as the Southerner himself. We utterly disapprove of any sacrifices of self-respect, and we should be chary of offering courtesies that would be repaid with insult. We would rather fling fraternization with the Church South to the winds forever than put the slightest slight on the humblest denomination of negro Methodism. The future peace of our country demands that we slack not our hands. We may have a long labor, demanding expenditures, perseverance, and sacrifice, but *there is a* FUTURE. We are laying foundations for centuries. The old proslavery element, if it continue its lazy, exclusive course of suicidal impolicy, will become effete, will be overslaughed by an incoming tide of live population, and must yield to the great law of the "survival of the fittest." The swell of the great middle current of population will in due time surge South, and we must be there to receive and embody it. We here record the prediction that our own true Methodism will, within a century, be chief occupant of the ground.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1873. (London.)—1. The Dogma of the Triduum; or, Christ's Three Days' Presence among the Departed. 2. On the Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles. 3. On the Proper Limits of Creeds. 4. The Materialistic Philosophy. 5. Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. 6. Dr. John Duncan of Edinburgh. 7. The Deluge and Archæology.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1873. (London.)—1. Organization and Life. 2. Government Telegraphs. 3. Lord Elgin and Sir Henry Lawrence. 4. The Writings of Berthold Auerbach. 5. Strauss' Confession of Faith. 6. Gareth and Lynette. 7. Steward on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 8. The Elementary Education Act.

---

and North-western States; that but a very small proportion settle in New England, comparatively few in the border States of Maryland and Kentucky, a somewhat larger number in Virginia, *but next to none in any of the Southern States except Texas.*

"*Fifth*—That, as a consequence of this, the center of population in the United States is steadily moving westward in the belt of country between parallels 40° and 44°, and near the line of the Ohio River."

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) Second Number. 1873.—*Essays:* 1. LEIMBACH, The Christian Poet Arator. 2. VOGT, On Heavenly Corporeity, ("Himmlische Leiblichkeit.") *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. MICHELSEN, On Several Parallel Sentences of the New Testament. *Reviews:* 1. KRAUSS, For and Against Keim. 2. ROSCH, Review of Keim's History of Jesus of Nazareth. *Miscellaneous:* 1. Programme of the Haag Society for the Defense of the Christian Religion, for the Year 1872. 2. Programme of the Teyler Theological Society at Haarlem, for the Year 1873.

The Christian poet Arator, who lived in the first half of the sixth century, is but little known. The last edition of his works was published in 1769, (*Arntzen, Aratoris subdiaconi de actibus apostolorum libri duo et epistolæ tres ad Florianum, Vigilium, and Parthenium.*) In the nineteenth century, when theologians and philologists, philosophers and historians, vie in the study of the ancient Church writers, and when so many relics of the ancient Church literature have been discovered, no one has devoted his special attention to Arator. The great German Theological Cyclopedia of Herzog and the Cyclopedia of M'Clintock and Strong do not even mention his name. This fate of oblivion is regarded by Mr. Leimbach as undeserved, and he has therefore made the forgotten poet the subject of special studies, the fruit of which is the above-mentioned article. Mr. Leimbach's previous essay on the poet Commodianus has met with the unanimous praise of the German theologians, and this treatise on Arator cannot but increase his reputation as a writer on the literature of the ancient Christian Church. As the information contained in this essay is not easily accessible in other books, we glean from it a few interesting points: Arator was a native of Liguria, born about 490. He was, after the early death of his father, brought up by Archbishop Laurentius, of Milan. He was, in 526, at the head of an embassy to the East Gothic king Theodoric, after which he appears to have held a position at the court, and finally to have attained the highest position next to the king—that of major-domus. Toward the close of his life he became tired of court-life, and about 541 he was ordained sub-deacon at Rome. The only work of Arator which is extant, and probably the only one which he composed, is a poetical commentary to the Acts of the Apostles, in two books, (*De Actibus Apostolorum*, libri ii.) Besides this work we have from him only three epis-

tles, to the Abbot Florianus, to Pope Vigilius, and to his teacher, Parthenius. The former, it seems, was to examine the book; to the Pope it appears to have been dedicated, and Parthenius was to recommend it in the circles of his friends. The Pope received it very favorably, placed it in the papal library, and ordered it to be publicly read in the Church of St. Peter *ad Vincula*. The letters are composed in distichs, but the work on the Acts in hexameter, of which the first book contains one thousand and seventy-six, and the second twelve hundred and fifty. The theological value of the writings of Arator is very small; his typical explanation of the passages of the Old Testament is often puerile. He is enthusiastically devoted to the interests of the Church of Rome, but seems to have had some semi-Pelagian views. Of considerable interest is the fact that according to Arator the Apostle Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome on the same day, but not in the same year, as the Apostle Peter. As the work was publicly read in one of the Churches of Rome by order of Pope Vigilius, it seems that the opinion that the Apostles Peter and Paul did not suffer martyrdom on the same day of the same year must at the time of Arator have been held in Rome itself. At all events it was regarded as perfectly orthodox. But not much later Pope Gelasius called the opinion that Paul died in another year than Peter a heretical twaddle. This is another illustration of papal infallibility.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Historical Theology.) 1873. Second Number.—1. WALTE, Contributions to a Church History of Bremen. 2. BONWETSCH, Substance, Origin, and Progress of the *Disciplina Arcani*.

The author of the second article, a Protestant pastor at Norka, in the Government of Saratov, Russia, states, in the preface to his very comprehensive essay, that it develops the views of his teacher, the well-known Lutheran Professor Harnack. The first part of the article consists of a valuable "literary review," giving the main points of all the books and essays of importance which have been written on the subject. It has thus far been generally assumed that the term *arcani disciplina* (discipline of the mysteries or system of secret instruction) was first introduced by Meyer in his work *De Recondita vet. Ecclesiæ Theologia*, (1670,) to denote the practice of the early Church of concealing from unbelievers, and even from catechumens,

certain parts of divine worship, especially of the sacraments. But Bonwetsch quotes a passage from a work published by the celebrated theologian Dallaeus, (Daille,) of the Reformed Church of France, in 1666, which proves that he used the term before Meyer. Soon after the introduction of the term the subject gave rise to a very animated controversy. The Jesuit Schelstrate, in his *Antiquitas illustrata*, (Antwerp, 1678,) attempted to press the *disciplina arcani* into the service of his Church to account for the silence of the early Church writers as to penance, image worship, and other practices. He was refuted by W. E. Tentzel in the essay *Dissertatio de Disciplina Arcani*, (1683.) Schelstrate defended himself in 1685 in *De Disciplina Arcani contra Disput. E. Tentzel*, and the latter replied in a very thorough and complete manner in his *Animadversiones.* (The two writings of Tentzel and the last named essay of Schelstrate are contained in *W. E. Tentzelii Exercitationes Selectæ*, Frankfort, 1692.) Since then a large number of theologians have written on this subject. The Catholic writers, among whom are Schollner, (1756,) Döllinger, (1826,) Lienhardt, (1829,) Toklot, (1836,) Lüft, (1844,) Hefele, (1846,) and Mayer, (1868,) have substantially only repeated the arguments of Schelstrate, and added but little that is new. On the Protestant side very able treatises were written on the subject in the seventeenth century by Bingham (in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*) and by Mosheim (in his Church History.) Bingham believes that the institution originated at the time of Tertullian, and that it had chiefly the pedagogical object, to prevent the Christian rites from being despised by those who did not yet understand them, and to prepare the catechumens for their better understanding. Mosheim showed more clearly than had been done before him that the *disciplina arcani* must be well distinguished from the system of reserve or concealment of theology, (*scientia arcani*, *μυστηριοσοφία*,) which sprang up in Egypt in the second century. He also believed it to have had a pedagogical aim, namely, to lead the catechumens from an understanding of the easier doctrines into the more profound mysteries of Christianity. A number of writers (among them Planck and Creuzer) saw in the *disciplina arcani* nothing but a childish endeavor to have in the Christian Church something similar to the pagan mysteries. This view has now been gen-

erally abandoned. The most important Protestant writers who in the nineteenth century have written on the subject are Richard Rothe, (in Herzog's Cyclopædia,) Zezschwitz, (*Katechetik*, 1863,) Niedner, (*Kirchengeschichte*, 1816,) and Harnack, (*Der christliche Gemeindegottesdienst*, 1854.) The two former find the origin in the catechumenate; the institution is defended as a natural outgrowth of the condition in which the Church found itself at that time. Niedner and Harnack, on the other hand, believe that it originated in a systematic transformation of the divine service into a mysterious form as a deviation from the primitive Christian basis of the Church, and in an undue extension of the hierarchical power. The essay is very instructive, and though it will, of course, not end the controversy, it must be read by all who wish thoroughly to understand the subject.

Art. VIII.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Revision of the English Version of the New Testament. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's and Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin; C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. With an Introduction by Philip Schaff, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. 12mo., pp. 562. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

In the hands of accomplished scholars and graceful writers like Schaff, Lightfoot, Trench, and Ellicott, biblical criticism becomes elegant literature. It is a curious fact that Germany should present in Dr. Schaff a mediator between England and America in the revision of our English Bible. Dr. Lightfoot is not so well known among us as the others named, but his Commentary on Galatians, published by W. F. Draper, proves him not one whit behind the chiefest.

It was in May, 1870, that the Convocation of Canterbury commenced the movement of revision. They resolved upon inaugurating not a new translation, but such a revision as, retaining all the traits that render our old English Bible venerable to our hearts, should remove those defects that by time or original error have impaired its clearness to the popular mind. A committee was appointed which divided itself into an Old Testament and a New Testament Company, whose first work, respectively, should be the

Pentateuch and the Gospels. To each of these Companies about a score of eminent scholars of various denominations were by invitation added.

In August, 1870, was commenced the work, by English invitation, of organizing two corresponding Companies in America. The whole arrangements have been made upon the assumption that while the Anglican Church was the proper authority to initiate the enterprise, the best Christian scholarship of all sects and denominations should be asked to combine, so that it might be the united work and be accepted as the one vernacular Holy Bible of our "English-speaking Christendom." To the best of our knowledge the movement has thus far been a delightful success. The respective companies of the two nations have commenced their harmonious work. It will be a task of years, perhaps a decade. But, by the blessing of God, it cannot fail, and we entertain the cheerful trust that the text of our English Bible will come forth purified and renewed from the healthful process.

It is easy for the critical scholar to pick out plentiful fly-specks upon every page of our English Bible. Words have become obsolete or changed their meaning; they were badly selected from original caprice, and errors were committed from the imperfect scholarship of the age. Sometimes there appears a mistranslation from doctrinal prepossession. And last of all, it is severed into chapters and verses, not as dexterously dissected by a scalpel, but as sliced and chopped by a butcher's cleaver. Yet in spite of all this its power as BIBLE has shown forth. It has been the unifying platform of English-speaking religions. There is no denying the wonderful fact, that all sections of dissent as they have left the primary bodies have gone off with King James' version under the arm. Scholars have often drawn up a fresh translation. Wesley furnished such a work of the New Testament; but he would have sooner flung it into the fire than allow it to disturb the supremacy of our old English Bible. We believe no attempt of the kind, as an appeal to denominational feeling, has been enabled to supplant our translation in the homes of the people. The revisers, therefore, approach the book with a true conservative feeling. Where palpable defects of text, or inaccuracy or obsoleteness of phrase, obscure or pervert the meaning, modifications are to be made.

One rule, however, which they have adopted seems to us to sacrifice universally acknowledged truth to an ultra-conservatism. The rule is that no word should be used in the revision which does

not already stand somewhere in the present version. We cheerfully agree that words already imbedded in our vernacular should be decidedly preferred. All present shock to the ordinary reader or hearer should be sedulously avoided. But *truth* is paramount to all things, and where there is no doubt in any section of scholars what truth is, surely truth should take the place of falsehood. This law of unquestionable truth requires the omission of the celebrated text of the Three Witnesses. It equally requires that *Hades* and *Gehenna* should not be translated by the same words. No scholar of any denomination believes that Hades means *hell* in the same sense as *Gehenna*, or in any sense as used in our vernacular. The conservatism that fears to transfer the word *Hades* to the English version is based in a want of due confidence in the good sense of the people. We believe that in a period of fifty coming years there is less danger in setting things right than in covering up wrong.

Dean Trench has made a very tolerable defense of King James' translators against the charge of mistranslating from doctrinal motives. His main ground is that a comparison of texts will show that in the Calvinistic points, for instance, they gave as many translations unduly unfavorable to their views as favorable. His statement we think to be numerically incorrect; yet Arminians have seldom imputed more than an unconscious Calvinistic prepossession to the translators. Of intentional mistranslation they have rarely been accused.

One of the most remarkable pro-Calvinistic uses of words has been perhaps, in some degree, the simple result of time. It is one to which we have seen no reference; and though pervading the whole Bible, is very likely to be overlooked even by Arminian revisers. It is the use of the future *shall* where our modern vernacular requires *will*. At the present day, at least, this has become a very false translation, for our present *shall* has an imperative force, just as it has always possessed in the Decalogue. Should a parent at the present day say to his sons at table, "One of you *shall* betray me," (John xiii, 21), it would be understood as a command. And so Rom. ix, 12, "The elder *shall* serve the younger," makes an imperative of a simple future. It may be indeed said that God's futures are imperatives. Whether that be so or not, we should allow God to use his futures instead of imperatives when he pleases.

Under this class of the false *shall* comes perhaps one of the most curiously mistranslated, interpolated, misquoted, and abused

texts in the Bible, noticed by us in our Quarterly some years ago. It is Psa. cx, 3, "Thy people *shall* be willing in the day of thy power." This is a military Messianic psalm, and the words really mean, Thy people [are] ready in the day of thy military gathering. There is really no verb at all; and the *shall be* of the translators, as well as our [are], is an interpolation. Then the *shall* is made a false imperative. Next follows a laughable mutilation of the text, current among our Calvinistic brethren, not only colloquially and among the people, but even disclosing itself in the deliberate writings of the best scholars. The false *shall be willing* is transmuted into a falser *make willing*. We have, for instance, a venerable volume by old Dr. Spring, of New England, on Free Agency, (which abolishes all Free Agency,) in which this text is quoted as a title-page motto, correctly according to our translation, but in entire perversion of the textual meaning. Next, our readers will find it used by Rev. Mr. Tyler, as it happens, on page 311 of this our present Quarterly, mutilated into "make willing." Next we will find it in Dr. Shedd's History of Doctrines, vol ii, p. 73, thus mutilated: "Makes him willing in the day of God's power." Next we will find it in Hodge on Romans: "God supersedes the necessity of forcing us by *making us willing* in the day of his power." And finally, we grieve to say it, even our friend, Dr. Schaff, has inserted a slight finger in this *Credit Mobilier*, by quoting with approbation this same unfortunate passage of Dr. Hodge's in his Romans, p. 95.* This is somewhat aside from the subject of the new revision of the Bible. It is additionally a suggestion to our Calvinistic friends to revise their proof-texts.

This volume will be a treat to biblical scholars; and especially will its perusal be a pleasant discipline for the student of the New Testament Greek text.

The Apocalypse Translated and Expounded. By JAMES GLASGOW, D.D., Irish General Assembly's Professor of Oriental Languages; Late Professor of the University of Bombay, and late Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay. 8vo., pp. 611. (Imported and on sale by Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong, New York.) Edinburgh: J. & T. Clark. 1872.

The problem of the Apocalypse ever possesses its fascinations for a numerous class of minds. In that problem there is a large amount to start with that is fixed and certain. There is a second large amount so definite that large sections of thinkers will agree, yet so indefinite that different and opposing schools will arise and

* Since writing the above we have found the same mutilation of the text in Dr. Hodge's Theology, vol. i, page 435.

debate their differences. There are, finally, a few passages that seem to crucify the interpreter who attempts to unfold them. Dr. Glasgow belongs to the school of *futurists*, who maintain that a great share of the volume is yet to be fulfilled; and of *post-millennialists*, who hold that the universal spread of the Gospel precedes the second advent. He adopts rigidly the year-day theory; applying it, indeed, where many maintainers of that view withhold it, to the one thousand years of the binding of Satan. This period he holds to have commenced at the first advent, and to extend to the second. It forms a series of ages at least three hundred and sixty thousand years in extent. This obliges him to give us an ingenious dissertation on the increase of the human race during that range of ages. How the earth can sustain so vast a volume of population he attempts, not with full satisfaction to himself, to show.

The arithmetic of the matter is indeed disturbing:

> In the Mechanics' Magazine I find this calculation: "The population of this country doubles itself in about fifty years. If the population is multiplied by 2 every 50 years, it will be multiplied by 4 every century; by 16 every 2 centuries; by 256 every 4 centuries: by more than 1,000 every 5 centuries: by more than 1,000,000 in 1,000 years' time:" and the writer then draws an appalling picture of the resulting poverty and distress. Now, according to the data, the calculation is true: on the assumption made, the population would, at the end of 1,000 years, be 1,049,376 times as great as at its beginning.
>
> But if the human race had in time past increased at this rate, there would in A. D. 1000 have been 1,049,376 times as many as in A. D. 1, which may be taken at about 100,000,000. There would thus have been in A. D. 1000 as many as 535,000 inhabitants to every square mile on the surface of the terraqueous globe, supposing all habitable land, without any sea. This amounts to an absolute impossibility.
>
> And if we reckon on to A. D. 1850, we should have, for each square mile, the last number multiplied by 131,072; a number for the bodies of whom there would not be standing-room—nearly three for each square foot.
>
> Or, even if we assume a more moderate rate of increase—the doubling of the population in 100 years—this, at the end of 1,000 years, would present a sum of 1,024 times as many as at present—1,000,000,000 multiplied by 1,024. Dividing the product by 65,000,000, the number of square miles of land, we should have 15,754 inhabitants to every square mile. This would cover the whole dry land of the earth with densely crowded streets and lanes, a condition to which it is manifestly impossible the world can be brought.

It is a fact in which the Chiliast triumphs that even a thousand years of peace and morality would completely overstock the earth. On the other hand, Dr. Glasgow retorts, that to deny such a protraction of Gospel triumph is to assign Satan a complete victory in the entire of the world's history. Nor can he believe that Providence has made such a mistake in proportioning the laws of population to the size of the earth as that wars, pestilences, massacres, infanticides, celibacies, and sexual preventions, are a blessing to mankind. There are many

hints in the Bible that the fertility of the earth will be increased and extended over new areas. New laws of physiology may develop themselves in the population of a purer age, by which the ratio of population may decrease. Nay, the very earth may, by divine power, working indeed through laws provided, yet by us not fully understood, be enlarged to ampler dimensions. So thinks Dr. Glasgow.

Apocalyptists will find Dr. Glasgow a learned and suggestive writer, even where they dissent from his opinions.

The New Life Dawning, and other Discourses of Bernard H. Nadal, D.D., late Professor of Historical Theology in the Drew Theological Seminary. Edited, with a Memoir, by Rev. HENRY A. BUTTZ, M.A. And an Introduction by Bishop R. S. FOSTER, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 421. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

The pure life, amiable nature, and clear intellect of Dr. Nadal endeared him to a large circle of friends, and required this fitting memorial. The biography, well written by Professor Buttz, is well worthy the study of our young men. The sermons display a style of transparent clearness, and while within the limits of true evangelic thought, there is a newness in their presentation, a fresh phase and a coloring, that will detain the most practical thinker in the same region. The sermon of the Evidential Force of Miracles is worthy, after all that has been said on that permanent topic, of perusal. The volume is well entitled to pass beyond the circle of both the author's acquaintances and the Church adorned by his ministry. The volume is well gotten up by the publishers, with an engraving that freshly calls the features of the original to the memory.

Lectures by the late John M'Clintock, D.D., LL.D., on Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology. (Delivered at Drew Seminary.) Edited by JOHN T. SHORT, B.D. With an Introduction by JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. 12mo., pp. 202. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

This volume is simply a summary of notes of Dr. M'Clintock's extemporaneous lectures by one of his students. As indorsed by Dr. Strong, it possesses a due degree of authenticity. It does not give the *matter* of theology, but furnishes a comprehensive survey of the whole field, and furnishes a directory to the student to the proper authors to be consulted. For such purposes it may be heartily recommended.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Oriental Linguistic Studies. The Veda; The Avesta; The Science of Language. By WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanscrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College. 12mo., pp. 416. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

The present volume embraces two chapters on the Vedas and Vedic religion in sixty-four pages; criticisms on Max Müller embracing sixty-nine pages; an account of the Avesta in about fifty pages. Our learned and luxuriant friend Max is abundantly criticised; some of his brilliant theories are unceremoniously demolished, and a reduction is made to more exact though bleaker fact. Then comes a brief dissertation on the origin of Language, and the book finishes with three full chapters of trenchant criticism on Bleek, Schleicher, and Steinthal, German authors who have ventured to project theories on the origin of language to be very exhaustively demolished by the merciless logic and sarcasm of the Yalensian iconoclast. It is dangerous for fanciful linguistic schemers and dreamers to venture out so long as Professor Whitney is in circulation. We need not say that in the entire department of Sanscrit literature the author ranks as a master both in Europe and America.

The old Aryan Bible, the Veda, is all psalms. It seldom rose, however, to a pure devotion. It does not, like the Bible of Shem, go back to the origin of things, and trace a clear historic line clear through the primitive ages. It fails to maintain the purity of ancient theism. It does, however, breathe a hope of immortality and presents a simple worship. The rise of Brahmanism over this pure primitive system is curious, both in its parallelisms and its differences with Romanism. A priestly caste gradually develops itself over the primitive, pure worship, and becomes exclusively the keepers of the sacred canon. It becomes rigorous, despotic, and sanctimonious. It keeps the canon so closely as to forget its contents, and even how to read them. Traditions grow up in utter, but unknown, contradiction to the sacred text, by which the priesthood become omnipotent. Nor is it until their brother Aryan comes from Europe and decyphers the sacred text that the Brahman discovers, to his dismay, that his traditions are at absolute war with his Bible.

Professor Whitney hints the belief natural to an enthusiastic specialist, that the Vedic is the earliest literature extant. What, however, is the era of a collection of hymns must be a pure matter of conjecture, drawn almost exclusively from indirect internal evidences. That the Vedic literature was growing into existence

about the time of the Exodus may be easily conceded. That the Exodus was closely and authentically connected with Egypt and the Sinaitic desert seems incomparably clearer than that the Vedas belonged to the Bactrian table-land. The historic nature of the Pentateuch, its interweaving with contemporaneous facts, give its authenticity and date an immense superiority of certainty over the Vedas. The document hypothesis of the Pentateuch opens before us a probability, also, that we have in Genesis a series of histories written by far earlier than Mosaic hands, bearing clear traits of being contemporaneous with the facts narrated. We think that any unbiased scholar would admit that Professor Tayler Lewis, in his *Divine and Human in Scripture*, has made it quite as certain that the narrative of the deluge was furnished by an eye-witness, as any archæologist has made it clear that the Vedas was written before the time of Solomon. What, in Vedic literature, bears on its face more truth-likeness than the history of Abraham and his patriarchal family? As a matter of mere secular criticism we venture to suspect that few scholars, capable of taking an impartial survey of the fields, would hesitate to decide that the Pentateuch is written in a true historic spirit, and that its claims to a far higher antiquity are sustained on far higher grounds than can be assumed for the Vedas even for the era usually assigned them. Thanks are abundantly due to Professor Whitney for his great labors in furnishing materials for judgment, but no thanks for any one-sided attempt, made with his biases, to forestall that judgment.

Mr. Whitney seems anxious, more than once, to assure us that while he denies any definite traces of Darwinism in existing languages, he heartily accepts, without repugnance, the probability of a bestial pedigree. He declares that he rather prefers a descent from a Darwinian ape than from the Pentateuchal Adam, on the ground that it is *what* we are, rather than *whence* we are, that constitutes our true value. But is it not our *whence* that constitutes our *what?* Is not our real nature decided by our origin? The entire nature of the ape-born man is *animal*, and its highest development claims only to be a perfected but perishable animalism; while to the divinely created man belongs, above the animal, a being of essentially a higher, an immortal sphere. The *truth* of the comparative origins is not here the question; for what Professor Whitney avers is that take the two *as they present themselves*, he rather prefers an apish to an Adamic origin. These are degrading utterances to come from a cultivated American scholar to whom we would desire to offer nothing but honor.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Santo Domingo, Past and Present, with a Glance at Hayti. By SAMUEL HAZARD, Author of "Cuba with Pen and Pencil." With Maps and numerous Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 511. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

Since the first day that Columbus found his first "land, ho!" upon this beautiful island it has been a scene of successive revolutions. Its first mild and gentle Indian inhabitants were completely extirpated by Spanish cruelty. Under their negro successors the island was the battle-ground of Spanish, French, English, and independent jurisdictions. Its present population, though free from foreign domination, badly educated in such a history, have not the steadiness of character to maintain a stable government. Life and property being absolutely insecure, industry has no existence, and nude poverty is the result. Baez, their present chieftain, is held by Mr. Hazard to be a true friend of his country. He has been repeatedly banished and alternately exalted to the Presidency. He is apparently a pure Spaniard but for a slight crinkle of the hair. He has slowly come to the conclusion that the taking a place as one of our States is the sole hope for his country.

We have no positive opinion to express as to the desirableness of such a result for us, but we are amazed that Senator Sumner, who exerted a main agency in the purchase of the rocks and icebergs of Alaska, should have so passionately opposed the acceptance of this rich and fertile island. It seems true, at first flush, that after enfranchising millions of ignorant negroes on our mainland, we can hardly afford to add to the list of uneducated voters. But it is to be specially noted that, as President Grant affirms, there are but one hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants on the island, while its area is capable of maintaining a population of ten millions. Saving the rights, then, of this one hundred and twenty thousand—enough for one respectable city—the island is a vacant territory. Nor could the small number of voters implied in such a population stand in any danger of swamping our Republic. So far as we can judge, General Grant's proposals to Congress have simply met with a whirlwind of excited side issues. We are waiting for the advent of "the sober second thought." What the decision of that will be we do not conjecture.

With its pictorials and maps Mr. Hazard's book is readable and instructive. As a literary work it possesses but slender merit. It abounds in low humor, streaked now and then with a very superfluous profanity. Its dedication page, exhibiting an

engraving, hardly decent, of Andrew C. White, daguerreotyped *à posteriore* on horseback, seems to suggest that neither of the congenial pair possesses a very high self-respect.

Journalism in the United States from 1690 *to* 1872. By FREDERIC HUDSON. Large 12mo., pp. 789. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

The daily journal is one of the striking phenomena of human history. Its existence is one of the most prominent differences between ancient civilization and modern. It possesses in itself an expansive power which seems likely, if no mundane physical revolution prevent, to render it universal. Its history is, therefore, a topic well worthy of study. It is here traced with considerable research and ability, and the present volume is perhaps the best standard reference on the subject.

It must be confessed that the daily press of our period, while favorable to the detection of offenses against the public good, and so far the supporter of public safety, is hardly the friend of a higher morality. Its tone is irreligious and destructive to the purer moral sentiments. A daily paper not sectarian, nor strictly and technically "religious," but taking Christian views of secular things, is the want of "the family" of our day.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The M. E. Churches, North and South. 24mo., pp. 90. St. Louis: South-western Book and Publishing Company. 1872.

Ill-omened is the book whose very title is a falsehood. Its author, a Southern bishop, ought to know that though there is a "Methodist Episcopal Church, South," there is no "Methodist Episcopal Church, North." The issue he here discusses is not between two sectional Churches, but between a sectional and a nation-wide Church. Our conferences spread from the Lakes to the Gulf. And when, in 1844, our General Conference set its house in order for a threatened Southern secession, it was with inflexible purpose that she retained her true, undivided, national title, THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Quite as deliberate and persistent has been the retention by the "Church South" of her sectional title. When the Southern Rebellion closed, and its General Conference reorganized, the question of assuming a national name—The Episcopal Methodist Church—was submitted to a popular vote. Earnestly did we hope and plead that it might be accepted. We desired that both Churches should be unsectional, cheerfully con-

ceding them the right of covering the entire North if able, and willing over every sinner they converted or church they built to pray for them a God-speed and God's blessing. Deliberately they preferred the sectional name, the unevangelical symbol of a sectional spirit. We concede their right (though not the evangelic rightness) to sectionalize themselves, but we deny their right to sectionalize us. To us our beloved country is—not a mere aggregate of States, drifted like flood-wood together, but—a NATION! And as Methodists and as citizens we claim that in every section, State, and town we are—not foreigners or "carpet-baggers," but—Americans *at home*. During the regimen of the despotic slave-power we were, indeed, exiled from the South. That infamous oligarchy, sustained by Southern Methodism, had but to point at one of us and say "an Abolitionist," and the summary sentence of Judge Lynch was ready. Thanks to the arbitrament of war, that day is past, that power is dethroned, and our whole country is measurably restored to us. And though our Southern friends may persist in sectionalizing themselves, never, never again shall they sectionalize us. Whatever the war has not settled, that it has settled.

This book is written in an accusatory spirit, and is to be considered as a public indictment by the Church South against our Methodist Episcopal Church *as being a Political Church!* It was written by one of her bishops; sanctioned by other bishops; published in her highest periodical, "under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South;" is indorsed to her people by resolutions of annual conferences, and is apparently sown broadcast by clerical hands on the popular mind of their Church. It is, therefore, a part of a permanent systematic effort on the part of the leaders of that Church to close the minds of their people against all conciliation, and to secure the permanent existence of sectional issue, regardless of its tendency to future disunion. Of course their success will be complete, as they alone possess the ear of their Church. They are, therefore, sowing their soil with falsehoods that will spring up in hatreds. But though the people cannot be reached, the guilty leaders may be exposed; and to that work we now apply a fearless hand. The spirit of the book may be estimated by extracts in our Synopsis, pages 326–331.

Our readers who see not the Southern Methodist weeklies are generally unaware with what industry the editors and letter-writers of the Church South have for years past been circulating among these people the impression that the "Church North" is a political

body. Its sermons are declared to be political harangues; its conferences are caucuses; it toadies to General Grant; and one pre-eminent romancer lately asserted, writing from New York, that no man could be elected President unless supported by the "Church North." Close beside this fiction is placed the twin fiction that the Church South is a maiden pure, who not only stands apart from politics, but is to stand in virgin sanctity the model of the non-political Church of the future.

The history of this Southern non-politicalism can be briefly told. Before the secession of the now Church South from our Church the South was politically in the ascendent, and the Methodist preachers South never uttered a syllable of non-politicalism. Southern Methodist preachers were freely appointed to office by the executive, or elected by popular vote, to foreign ministries, to legislatures, and to Congress. We venture to affirm that at that period the Southern Methodist preachers filling political office were as five to one of the North. When, in 1844, secession from the Church was under discussion in General Conference, it was but too well known that the Southern preachers were in communication with, and probably acted under dictation from, the great political nullifier, John C. Calhoun. When the Church South was organized, *slavery was* by it *declared to be a purely political question* with which the Church has nothing to do, and the protest against slavery in the Discipline, inherited from our fathers, in accordance with Wesley himself, was erased from its pages as *a piece of politics*. Wesley, Asbury, Coke, the whole body of our antislavery fathers, were thereby thus labeled as "political parsons," and the Methodist Discipline, down to that moment, as a political book. When the political secession of the Southern States approached, it may be safely asserted that Southern Methodism gave a magnificent lead to the movement, people, preachers, and periodicals. We challenge a denial of this statement. The entire body of Southern Methodism before secession were unanimous for active secession, and, so far as secession in act is treason, it was solidly a treasonable Church. During the war her pulpits resounded with warlike sermons against the National Government, and several of her leading Churches as well as ministers were *shut up* for treason. They nobly sustained their lead in the treasonable movement by bravery in the treasonable war. It is conceded by at least some rebel generals that none prayed more fervently for their country's ruin than the Methodist chaplains, none aimed more deadly bullets at their country's heart than the Methodist soldiers. When,

however, the national victory brought them to reflection, *the non-political drama commenced.* It would, indeed, we think, have been wise for the Church South, after such politics as hers had been, to retire modestly from the political field. Had she done so, at least for a season, she would have merited our commendation. What she did do was to play off a non-political *show*, and then remain as political, and as treasonably political, as ever. When her conferences were reorganized the word was given out, "We must now say nothing about politics!" Bishops would say, "Not a word about politics during our session." The cue was given and taken, and from that time to this they have lifted up solemn sanctimonious eyes with—"The Church North is a political Church, but we, we are virgin of politics. The age needs us as a model non-political Church."

Of course, with their definition of politics, we are, and we are morally bound to be, political. If to be as individuals and as an organism opposed to slavery, with its human auction-blocks, its laws prohibiting education, and its nullification of the marriage contract, is politics, we are political and they are not. If to be attached to our country's unity, history, and nationality, is politics, we are political and they are not. If loyalty to our national Government, and a desire for its prosperity among the nations of the earth, are politics, we are political, and we fear they are not; for in ten years past we have seen from the organs of that Church not one expression of affection for our whole country or pride for our present national greatness.

We suppose, however, that our Church perfectly well understands, and with individual exceptions has correctly practiced, the true principle in relation to politics. No Church ever safely can (and our Church never has so done) commit herself to any subserviency to a political party, or take sides upon any secular political question. To mix in political campaigns, to support a political party or candidate as such, or to make any advantage by linking with any political organization, is what we as a Church have never done. But politics and ethics, nay, politics and religion, do not always stand apart, pure and simple. They are often involved together, and a Church must beware how she abdicates all right to interest herself in a moral question because it is implicated in legislation or party issue. It is the great spiritual and moral interests of the world that are committed to the Church. To those she must be true whatever the political platforms may be, favorable or unfavorable. The Church must maintain the exist-

ence of the Sabbath, or the sacredness of the Holy Scriptures, or the existence of God, even if a German political party should lay an anti-Sabbath, or anti-Bible, or an atheistic plank in its political platform. The Church must maintain the doctrine of the freedom of conscience, even if a political Romanistic party should make submission to the Pope its platform. And so if the rumsellers should make the abandonment of all checks to drunkenness a political platform, that does not discharge us from all obligation to maintain the cause of temperance. When the question of liquor-selling is put to a town vote, the pulpit does its duty in proclaiming the obligation of the voter to exercise his suffrage in the fear of God and in behalf of right. And so when the question is whether the marriage institution should be annulled, can the action of any political party *pro* or *con* annul the obligation of the Church to maintain the laws of God? And so, if it were proposed by a political party in caucus assembled that we should establish the auction-block in our streets, where, after ancient Southern fashion, handsome young mulatto girls could be exposed to a leering, lecherous crowd to be sold to the highest bidder, we trust that our Methodist pulpits would, like Wesley himself, "preach politics" in tones of thunder. And so when a Congress, infamous in future history, enacted at the dictation of the Southern slave-masters a fugitive slave law, requiring us to aid the slave-catcher in stealing his victim, it is one of the pleasant recollections of our personal life that we denounced the iniquity from the pulpit with a power that we know was forcibly felt by its supporters and abettors. Are not politicians and parties amenable to the law of God? Can governments or administrations annul the divine authority? Are the immutable laws of right and righteousness non-existent on the election grounds? Must I, as a preacher, study the newspapers and scan the political platforms in order to know what I may or may not preach? Must I ask the politician what sin I must rebuke? Must the Church take law from the caucus? Why, this pure non-politicalism, so called by this cowardly Southern bishop, is real submission to the politicians. It was born of a long subserviency to the slave-holding oligarchy. Compelled by that execrable power to be silent on their great crime of slavery, the Southern ministry is now attempting to palm off their degraded subserviency to political dictation into a virtue and a purity. Did the Church South really intend to abdicate her office, as a Church, to rebuke all sin and sustain all holiness, thereby exempting political sins and sinners from the jurisdiction of the moral law, we should

hold her for that very fact sadly corrupt. But she really intends no such thing. As we have shown in our Synopsis on her "Southern Review," pp. 321–334, she is intensely political now. Give her a chance for court favor, and she would be supplest of ecclesiastical courtiers. All her affectation of purity now is simply in the absence of all temptation.

The ethics of the Bible do not encourage the abandonment of ethics to politicians. Moses was both a politician and a warrior, who opposed proslaveryism headed by royalty to its face, emancipated some millions of slaves, and founded a politico-religious constitution with the rite of circumcision for its base. Samuel was a prophet-politician. Jeremiah was punished and slain for "political preaching." The prophets, indeed, were uniformly "political-preachers;" in the sense, that is, of arraigning rulers and parties for wicked laws and policies, or, as they expressed it, for framing iniquity by a law. In this sense the Old Testament is a political, religious, book. Christ was born heir of the Palestinean political crown, and his birth sent dismay into the palace of Herod the political usurper. His worshipers from the East disobeyed the royal command. Jesus himself arraigned the ruling classes, decided that they should pay tribute to Cesar, was arraigned for treason, refused to plead, and cited his judge to his own judgment-bar. John the Baptist denounced the ruling classes of his day, and died a martyr to his faithfulness in rebuking royal sin. St. Stephen was stoned to death for announcing to the Government the cessation and overthrow of the State, city, and constitution. The apostles were arraigned before the national parliament, and refused to obey its decision in deference to the command of God. St. Paul spent his life in abolishing circumcision, the very basis of the Jewish politics and race. St. John finishes the bold interference of religion with politics by painting the Roman Government as a beast, and exhibiting Jesus Christ as slaughtering the kings of the earth. The great problem of the Church is, while keeping clear of party fetters, to sustain any party in its good and to oppose every party in its evil. The evangelical Churches of the North, our Methodism included, are well solving that problem. The Southern Church is proclaiming the immoral dogma that you may label any public sin "politics" and withhold all moral action.

The Southern Church is far more exclusively made up of one party than our own. We venture to believe that if a census could be taken there are ten Democrats in our Church to one Republican in the Church South. Dr. Thomas Carlton, a

Democrat, well known as such by the Church, was elected, and repeatedly re-elected, to the most responsible post in the Church throughout the entire antislavery battle. Does a single instance of a Republican in high position exist in the Church South? Two outspoken Democrats, the one a minister, the other a layman, were elected by Republican constituents to the last General Conference, and by the General Conference were elected to high quadrennial offices. Their politics formed no element in the canvasses *pro* or *con*. Can the Church South name any parallel Republican instances in their own body? The writer of this has a reverend brother-in-law, a true Methodist preacher in our Church, a life-long Democrat, who filled office under President Pierce, and who never uttered a complaint in our hearing that his democracy or office ever cost him any disparagement with his ministerial brethren. The present Democratic Mayor of New York, we are told, has always been a regular attendant at a Methodist Church. The late Moses F. Odell, a distinguished Democratic member of Congress from Brooklyn, was as eminent in Methodist enterprise as he was in Democratic politics; and we have heard him make his boast before public audiences that he never found any difficulty in carrying his religion into his politics. These are but a few instances within our immediate observation. How many more there are we do not know, for it is not a question often suggested. But we believe that we have a large minority of earnest Democrats, loyal to our Church, filling often responsible positions, and ready to testify that their politics cast no shade on their Churchly standing. We shall be glad to be told, what we do not at present believe, that there is such a minority of Republicans in the Church South. Which, then, is the political Church?

Periodicals.

The Southern Methodist Press.

Several of the Southern Methodist weeklies have intimated their displeasure at our late article on the "Ku-Klux Conspiracy." We select, as the best specimen, the following from Dr. Summers, our answer to which is an answer to the whole. His words are:

Then comes a second paper on Peter Cartwright, from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which might have been spared in a work like this; and so emphatically may be that which follows, "The Ku-Klux Conspiracy." Mr. Arnold, the writer, may be sincere in his statements, but the people of Alabama will not consider it all Gospel when such a man as Lakin is depended upon as credible authority! We know nothing about the Ku-Klux—we never, to our knowledge, saw any one who belonged to a Ku-Klux Clan. We have no doubt that some Southern men,

stung by the outrages to which they have been subjected, have sought redress in an unlawful way. We have uniformly denounced all such methods by whomsoever, and under whatsoever provocations, they have been resorted to; and hence we are the more indignant when the insinuation is made that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was the *protégé* of the Ku-Klux conspirators. We presume not a single Southern Methodist ever belonged to the clan, whatever it might be; and we never before, so far as we can recollect, met with the insinuation that the M. E. Church, South, was in any way connected with this or any other unlawful combination, or patronized by it. Our preachers have been persecuted, and some of them put to death, by *loyal* sympathizers with the Northern Church, and some of them members of it; but when have our people interfered, or sought to interfere, with our co-religionists of the North, or with any others? The subject is an unpleasant one, and we are sorry that we have to revert to it again.

On all this we remark:

1. If Dr. Summers, or any other Southern editor, has ever "denounced" either "the Ku-Klux" violences, or any other outrages, such as burning school-houses, in good round earnest terms, truly and unequivocally calculated to arrest their course, we have never seen, either lately, or during all the years of Lynch rule, the paragraph containing the denunciation. We have usually read the columns of the "Nashville Advocate" carefully, and such a denunciation, with any hearty purpose of preventing disorder, has never yet gladdened our eye. If he will republish that paragraph, we will re-republish and do it generous justice. It has been largely in the power of that press, by earnest and united action, to check lawlessness and to pacificate the country, and to banish all divisive feelings between North and South, both Church and State. It would be a blessed work of peace and unity for a truly Christian Church. But not only has that press passed over these outrages in silence, or noted them, as Dr. Summers here has, with half apology and denial, but its general temper and position, from its Quarterly downward, has been favorable to sectional repulsion, popular disloyalty, and permanent issue. Their denunciations are pronounced, not upon the Ku-Klux, but rather, as in the present instance, upon those who expose the Ku-Klux atrocities. If that press and Church have not consciously made the Ku-Klux their *protégé*, the Ku-Klux has had no very apparent discountenance from them, and is the legitimate outcome of the position, principles, and temper of that press and Church, exhibited through all their organs from the Quarterly and Bishops downward.

2. The intimation that our Ku-Klux article was out of place in our Quarterly we take cheerfully. But the difficulty is, that while these brethren are very tender about onslaughts from the North, they are very jubilant over onslaughts upon the North. They relish broadsides finely, provided the broadsides all pour but one way. They would like a whole stream of avalanches to

rush in permanent cataract northward, but it is quite "out of place" for such an article to come rolling southward. When Leftwich published his book rehearsing, truly or falsely, the outrages of war in Missouri, that book was editorially eulogized as surely true, was episcopally authenticated, and energetically circulated. Said the truculent Bishop Marvin in indorsing that book, (an indorsement subsequently spread at full length on the pages of the "Southern Review,") "I have met some who say 'Let the past sleep; let all crimes, and the bad blood engendered by them, be buried forever.' I have not so learned Christ." No, the episcopal seditionist had doubtless derived his inspirations from an opposite quarter. And when we rebuked this truly Ku-Klux utterance, Dr. Summers responded by a defense and eulogy of this sanctimonious performer of Satan's dirty work under the abused name of Christ. More lately, that series of episcopal libels upon our Church, entitled, "Methodist Episcopal Churches, North and South," has received every indorsement by authority and circulation among the people possible. Now we have for years been willing to forget the past. We have heartily desired the dismissal of unkindly feelings, and silence over all unpleasant memories. We have prayed for the interchange of the guileless right hand in fraternity, and, if expediently best, reunion. But let not our Southern brethren cherish the dream that all the forgetting is to be on one side. We have many a terrible memory to recall, of Southern outrages; not merely atrocities in war, but violences committed in time of peace. We might republish, for instance, the history, written by the late Dr. Elliott, of the martyrdom of Anthony Bewley, murdered for adherence to our Church, earlier than 1856. There is the unwritten history of the breaking up of an annual conference, under Bishop Simpson, by a Missouri mob, also before 1856. There is another history of the breaking up of our conference under Bishop Janes, by a Texas mob, after 1856. Perhaps Dr. Summers, who is so clairvoyant as to be sure "that *not a single Southern Methodist* ever belonged to the [Ku-Klux] Clan," can expand his assertions so far as to assure us that no Methodist ever mixed in the mobs that murdered Bewley, or broke up our peaceful conferences. But while we have ever been willing, and are at this moment, to "forget the past," we promptly decline the duty of silently accepting the continuance of Southern indictments until these self-righteous brethren infer, from our very forbearance, that we are confessed culprits, and that our offer of fraternity is a begging of pardon.

3. We have lately seen nothing more preposterous than Dr. Summer's denial of the Ku-Klux atrocities, especially attested by the public oath of "such a man as Lakin." This language regarding Mr. Lakin is part and parcel of the continuous insult with which our ministers are treated by the Church South; more especially when those ministers proffer courtesies. This is the magnanimous return for the uniform courtesy with which the ministers of the Church South are treated here in the North, and by our own Church. Mr. Lakin, with the unimpeached character of a Christian minister, went into open court, testified upon oath, in the presence of, and under cross-examination by, the most talented opposing counsel, to public facts in large masses, subjecting himself to the easiest conviction of perjury if his statements were false. Even the able counsel for the prisoners, the eminent Southerner, Reverdy Johnson, said: "I have listened with unmixed horror to some of the testimony which has been brought before you. The outrages PROVED are shocking to humanity; they admit of neither excuse nor justification; they violate every obligation which law and nature impose upon every man." Such, we are ashamed to say, is the frank truthfulness of a "worldly" lawyer in contrast with the *Christian* editor!

Miscellaneous.

Sacramental Addresses and Meditations. By HENRY BELFRAGE, D.D. Eighth edition, complete in one volume. 12mo., pp. 411. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

Brief, glowing paragraphs, uttered, according to the custom of good old Scotia, successively to the successive sets of communicants at the communion table.

Wesley and Swedenborg. A Fraternal Appeal to Methodist Ministers, inviting them to Consider the Relations of Methodism to the New Church. By E. R. KEYES. 12mo., pp. 72. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1872.

Written in a spirit of Christian candor worthy all respect. But we can hardly second the invitation to our ministry to consider the question of merging into a system so far from Christ, and showing so little aggressive power as Swedenborgianism.

Bogatzky's Golden Treasury. 16mo., pp. 384. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

The Well in the Desert. An Old Legend of the House of Arundal. By EMILY SARAH HOLT. 12mo., pp. 144. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

The Curate's Home. By AGNES GIBERNE. 12mo., pp. 442. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1872.

Martyrs to the Tract Cause. A Contribution to the History of the Reformation. 16mo., pp. 164. By J. F. HURST, D.D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1872.

Afternoons with Grandma. From the French of Madame Carrand. By Mrs. MARY KURMIONT. 12mo., pp. 320. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

The Man With the Book; or, The Bible Among the People. By JOHN MATTHIAS WEYLLAND. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 268. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

The Lost Found, and the Wanderer Welcomed. By WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York. 12mo., pp. 170. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

Fruit Recorder and Cottage Gardener. A. M. PURDY, Editor. Monthly. 4to., pp. 192. Palmyra, New York. 1873.

Purdy's Small Fruit Instructor. Containing Plain and Practical Directions for Planting, Growing, and Marketing Small Fruits. A. M. PURDY, Editor. 12mo., pp. 64. Palmyra, New York. 1873.

Renata of Este. A Chapter from the History of the Reformation in France and Italy. By Rev. CARL STRACK, Pastor near Giessen, Germany. Translated from the German by CATHERINE E. HURST. 12mo., pp. 252. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Vick's Illustrated Floral Guide for 1873. 12mo., pp. 132. Rochester, N. Y. 1873.

The Story of the Nile. Travels and Adventures in Nubia and Abyssinia. By the Author of "The White Foreigners from Over the Water." Five Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 157. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

Songs for Worship. By T. C. O'KANE. 16mo., pp. 160. Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

The Constitutional History of England. From the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II. By HENRY HALLAM, LL.D. Incorporating the Author's Latest Additions and Corrections, and Adapted to the Use of Students. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. 12mo., pp. 747. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby. By CHARLES DICKENS. With 52 Illustrations, by C. S. Reinhart. 8vo., green and gilt, pp. 339. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

The Foreigner in Far Cathay. By W. H. MEDHURST, H. B. M. Consul, Shanghae. 12mo., green and gilt, pp. 204. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

The Complete Poetical Works of John Greenleaf Whittier. Household Edition. 12mo., pp. 395. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., late Ticknor & Fields, and Fields, Osgood & Co. 1873.

Had You Been in His Place. By LIZZIE BATES. 12mo., pp. 422. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1872.

The Personal History of David Copperfield. By CHARLES DICKENS. With a Portrait of the Author, and Sixty-one Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 361. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Life Lessons from the Book of Proverbs. By WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY, D.D. 12mo., pp. 361. New York: T. Whitaker.

An Ecclesiastical History from the Thirteenth to the Nineteenth Century. By the Rev. C. M. BUTLER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 595. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger.

Received too late for notice in this number:

Fisher's History of the Reformation. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Draper's Year-Book of Science. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Speaker's Commentary, Vol. II. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Gregg's Enigmas of Life. J. R. Osgood & Co.

J. & R. LAMB,

59 CARMINE-STREET, NEW YORK.

ESTABLISHED A. D. 1857.

CHURCH FURNITURE & DECORATIONS.

SIXTH AVE. CARS PASS THE DOOR.



ILLUMINATED
LORD'S PRAYER.



ALMS BOXES
FOR ENVELOPES.

BAPTISMAL FONTS.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL
SILK
CLASS-BANNERS,

ALL COMPLETE,

With Walnut Staff and Cross-Bar Metal Mountings,

Five Dollars Each.

METHODIST
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1873.

ART. I.—CAREY'S SOCIAL SCIENCE.

Principles of Social Science. By H. C. CAREY. In Three Volumes. 8vo. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1858, 1865.

Manual of Social Science; Being a Condensation of the "Principles of Social Science," by H. C. Carey, LL.D. By KATE M'KEAN. One Volume. 12mo. Philadelphia: Henry Carey Baird, Industrial Publisher. 1869.

THE creation and distribution of wealth form a subject of vital interest to every member of the community. As these principles are correct or incorrect, the prosperity of society increases or diminishes. There is no subject of which it is so necessary that there should be a clear understanding, and on which it is so desirable that there should be a substantial agreement among its teachers; yet, strange to say, there is scarcely a subject in the whole range of human investigation on which there is so obvious and obstinate a disagreement, or one in which the antagonism seems so hopeless, as that involving the relations of labor and capital, population, commerce, rent, wages, taxes, money, credit, and those of government, to productive industry. In the present situation of the subject several questions are in order. Is it necessary that the great majority of the human race should live in pinching poverty, a large proportion being unable to avoid the constant peril of starvation, while the larger part of those who are not positively poor have only a moderate competence? Is it necessary that while man is constantly acquiring more and more of those qualities and

abilities which give him the mastery over nature and compel her to yield two, ten, twenty, a hundred and a thousand fold more than at first for the supply of his wants, that the condition of humanity on the whole should be growing but little, if any, better, and the inequality greater than ever? Is there, as some of the social philosophers teach, something in the constitution of the world, a kind of total depravity in the nature of things, which forbids us to hope for any considerable improvement? Are there any beneficent principles which govern or are intended to govern men in their mutual relations and in their relations to the material world? In fact, is there, or can there be, any such thing as social science?

In the volumes before us Mr. Carey attempts to answer these and similar questions. He arrives at results which are encouraging to the interests of humanity, though in doing so he virtually, and in many cases formally, contradicts the views presented by a majority of modern writers on the subjects discussed. In the literary character of the work there is much that one might find fault with. The style is not altogether attractive; there is much repetition, sometimes carelessly and sometimes of intent, the author desiring to keep before the reader's mind certain thoughts which, though of more or less importance, and not to be forgotten, might nevertheless be treated with rather more freedom; and there are certain notions entertained by the author of which his mind seems disproportionately possessed, and which are perpetually asserting themselves both in season and out of season, and almost as frequently the latter as the former. There is also some want of clearness in the definition and use of terms, especially some which he uses in a sense other than the ordinary. But the amount of valuable information he communicates is incalculable. His power of searching out facts and discerning their nicest relations is most admirable. His intelligence on the subjects investigated is nearly boundless, and few men have the faculty of grouping the various items of knowledge pertaining to any single topic so as to make them exhibit the real philosophy involved in them which is displayed by him. In all the vast and innumerable complications of the subject, where so many others become hopelessly bewildered, he never loses himself, though he may frequently fail to satisfy his read-

ers with the clear view which he evidently has himself. His philosophy is of the simplest, and yet the most comprehensive. At every step it commends itself to the practical judgment, and is altogether the most natural and sensible conceivable. However one may be unwilling to admit some of his conclusions, it is difficult to dispute his premises or to find a flaw in his chain of argument. It is altogether the most valuable contribution on the subject which our own country has yet furnished.

Mr. Carey draws a clear line of distinction between Social Science and Political Economy. The former, according to his definition, treats of the natural laws underlying and governing the whole subject, and is thus, not in name merely, but in fact, a *science.* Political economy is the *art* by which the obstructions to the operations of the laws embodied in social science may be removed.

Mr. Carey insists that the real object of social science is *man.* Most of the other writers on this subject have maintained that it is *material wealth.* This is an important difference; yet it arises principally after all from the various and conflicting answers that have been made to the question, What constitutes wealth? No two of the social philosophers exactly agree in their definitions, and some hardly undertake to define it. M'Culloch represents it as comprising "those useful or agreeable articles or products which possess exchangeable value." Matthews identifies wealth with "those material objects which are necessary, useful, and agreeable to man." Adam Smith commonly describes it as "the annual produce of land and labor." Amasa Walker says it includes "all objects of VALUE, and no other;" and "*value* is the exchange power which one commodity or service has in relation to another." It does not include desirableness nor utility. J. S. Mill defines it as "all useful or agreeable things which possess exchangeable value." He does not seem to think it of very great importance whether what are called immaterial products, such as the skill of a workman, or any other natural or required power of body or mind, shall be called wealth or not.

These writers, and various others, while differing with one another, agree in the general principle of excluding from their conception of wealth all that pertains to the feelings, the affec-

tions, and the intellect, and in regarding all labor as unproductive which does not result in some material form of good. It is true that some, perhaps most, of them do intuitively and casually assume a kind of value in these immaterial elements, but they thus contradict themselves and practically discard their own more deliberate conclusions.

Mr. Carey declares that "wealth consists in the power to command the ever gratuitous services of nature." This power is to be found in *man*, and not elsewhere. It grows with the individual development and the increase of association; and the latter, contrary as it seems to be to the conception of some of our modern teachers, depends upon and is proportionate to the former. The author adopts, or perhaps anticipates, Herbert Spencer's doctrine, that development is "from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous," which is doubtless true, so far at least as society is concerned. There is certainly an incalculably greater diversity of individual character in a highly civilized society than in the savage state. This individual diversity is what impels more strongly to association; for individuals of like character and aptitude cannot well supplement the services of each other, only those of diverse capabilities. The man without legs, but with good eyes, could, with some advantage to both, be carried upon the sturdy shoulders of the blind man, while the eyes of one acted for both. But if the blind undertake to guide the blind, we know the result. It is by individual development that the powers and resources of nature become known. It is by association and combination that they are rendered available. Wealth, then, is more in man than in nature; and it is hence that social science and political economy have to do with man rather than with his appurtenances. Social science, with Carey, is "the science of the laws which govern man in his efforts to secure for himself the highest individuality, and the greatest power of association with his fellow-man."

Mr. Carey's *method* is peculiar. Most writers on this subject pursue the *à priori* method, reasoning from assumptions and not from facts; asserting by implication, at least, as Mr. Mill does explicitly, that "what is true in the abstract is true in the concrete, with proper allowances." The main difficulty is probably almost always in regard to "the proper allowances."

Here is, doubtless, a fruitful source of the innumerable errors made and repeated in social questions, and of the hopeless antagonisms before referred to. Mr. Carey reasons inductively, contemplating and collating facts, appealing to history, and applying the simple rules of arithmetic and the tests of practical judgment, though he is not wanting in deductions from general principles.

The doctrine of *value*, first presented by Mr. Carey thirty-five years ago, has since been adopted by many who are of quite an opposite school of thinkers on social subjects, and has now come to be the generally accepted view. In the older text-books published thirty years ago or more, and even in some still used, the value of an article was defined as "the equivalent of the labor expended in its production." It was illustrated in various ways. If a hunter kill fifty hares in a day, and a fisherman catch a hundred fish, the former will not give a hundred hares for a hundred fish, but only the product of his day's labor for the product of the other's day's labor, and in that proportion. But suppose the extraordinary incident of two hundred hares being cornered in a place where they could be taken and dispatched by the labor of two hours. Will the hare-hunter in this case be willing to exchange his booty for the product of two hours' labor of the fisherman? He should be willing, if the universal measure of value is the labor expended in the product. But he will doubtless reason in a practical and unscientific way that he is not likely to have another such opportunity for a very long time, and perhaps will never again secure so much game at so little outlay, and that if he parts with his present product it will take him four days to replace it. Therefore he demands the product of four days' instead of two hours' labor for his two hundred hares. He values his game not by the amount of labor expended in securing it, but by what it would probably require to reproduce it.

Bastiat illustrates the principle by the chance finding of a magnificent diamond by a stroller on the sea-beach. He will offer it to the man who desires such an article, not for the product of one or two seconds' labor which he put forth in picking up his treasure, but for the product of a whole year's work. If the buyer object to paying the finder so much for what has

cost so little, he is presented with the alternative of finding a diamond for himself. But as this might require ten years of labor, he would doubtless rather pay the price required by the finder. Obviously here, as in a thousand other instances in practical life, the common sense repudiates the doctrine that the value of an article is to be estimated by the amount of labor expended in its production. Yet this has been laid down as a reliable principle by eminent teachers of this science. One is reminded of the comical anecdote of the soldier who, on carrying his watch to be repaired, was told that it would cost nearly as much to repair it as originally to purchase it. The soldier replied that he wouldn't mind paying twice that, for he gave a French fellow a knock over the head for the watch, and he would willingly give any man two knocks to mend it! To avoid this absurdity, Bastiat defines value as the relation between the service to be rendered and that which is to be received in return. But our author objects to this definition that value may exist even where there is no possibility of the exchange of services. The solitary Crusoe on his island attached a value to the clumsy canoe which it had taken him many months to construct—a value, too, much greater than he attached to it afterward when, being joined by Friday, he had been able by combination of effort to build a better one in a few days. Here appears, too, another reason for rejecting the old definition. The new canoe is much better than the old one, but it has cost much less labor. It is not, then, the labor originally required to produce an article which measures its value, but the amount of labor which would be necessary to its reproduction if it were destroyed, and this, in an advancing civilization, is usually a constantly diminishing quantity; that is, in an advancing civilization the cost of *reproduction* is always less than that of *production*.

Value is the measure of the resistance to be overcome in obtaining those commodities required for our purposes—of the power of nature over man. The great object of MAN in this world is to acquire dominion over NATURE, compelling her to do his work; and with every step in that direction labor becomes less severe, while its reward increases. With each the accumulations of the past become less valuable, having less power over labor. With each the power of association grows with increase in the development of the faculties of the individual man, and equally constant in-

crease in the power of further progress; and thus while combination of action enables man to overcome the resistance of nature, each successive triumph is attended by increased facility for further combinations, to be followed by new and greater triumphs.—*Principles of Social Science*, vol. i, p. 158.

Here we see the great principle that value, and consequently all wealth, depends upon the condition and character of *man* individually and socially, and that it is with man as the producer of wealth, and not wealth as an object of production, that social science has to do.

This doctrine of value is found not in a few chance cases like those previously cited, but it evinces itself every-where and evermore in the progress of society. The consequences of it are wide-spread, and would, if understood and accepted, have much to do in correcting the evils which afflict society.

The lone man on the island, without tools, with no power of association, can do very little. He can with his hands gather a few wild fruits and roots to assuage his hunger, and, perhaps, by availing himself of some shelving rock or cave, construct himself a shelter. Finding a limb of a tree torn off by the wind, or wrenching it away by his own strength, he may fashion a rude club with which he may slay wild beasts and furnish himself with additional and superior sustenance. A kind of hook may be formed from the bones of the animals thus slaughtered, and fish caught. The skins of animals furnish clothing, and their entrails make strings, by means of which, and the discovered elasticity of wood, he provides himself with bow and arrows, new implements of power. He can now secure for himself in a day as much food as before in a week. The *value* of the product is reduced sevenfold, or, what is the same thing, the value of the man's labor is increased sevenfold. This illustrates and evinces the propriety of regarding value as a measure of the resistance which nature offers to man's efforts, as also the importance of regarding *man* as the proper subject of social science.

It is thus with every advance of man in acquiring power over nature. That which before cost much labor now costs little. Years ago twelve or fifteen yards of cotton cloth were all that one diligent worker could produce in a week. Since then the powers of nature have been enlisted as helpers, so that

what was the product of days is now secured in an hour. If we were offered in the market a piece of cloth made a hundred years ago, its value and price would not be estimated by the labor expended in its original production, but by that which would now be required to produce an article of the same kind. It follows that in a healthy state of society labor is always in a rising market, and raw material is constantly approximating the finished products in value.

If it be objected that this is not the case with land, which is always advancing in value in proportion to the advancement and prosperity of the community, it is to be said in reply, that, properly speaking, land in itself has no value, and that it nowhere in the world has even an apparent value equivalent to the amount of labor which has made it available for any human purpose or use. The same law prevails here which is discerned every-where else. The services of nature are always gratuitous, but man needs knowledge, wisdom, and skill to avail himself of them. There are certain obstacles to be overcome, and the force of resistance in these obstacles to man's efforts is the measure of value in any given case. As these obstacles are overcome the value diminishes, though the utility may be greatly enhanced. The present price of a particular piece of land may be several times greater than it was years ago, but it is to be observed that this increase of value is not in the land as it was, if such a thing could be imagined, but in what has been put into, or upon, or around it, in the improved condition of itself, and in the vastly improved relations it sustains to other things, both public and private, which other things are the result of labor.

Twelve years since the annual value of the land and the mines of Great Britain, including therein the share of the Church, was estimated by Sir Robert Peel at £47,800,000; which, at twenty-five years' purchase, would give a principal sum of nearly twelve hundred millions of pounds. Estimating the wages of laborers, miners, mechanics, and those by whom their labors are directed, at fifty pounds per annum each, the land would then represent the labor of twenty-four million of men for a single year, or of one million for twenty-four years.

Let us now suppose the island reduced to the state in which it was found by Cesar, covered with impenetrable woods, (the timber of which is of no value because of its superabundance,) and abounding in marshes and swamps, heaths and sandy wastes, and then

estimate the quantity of labor that would be required to place it in its present position, with its lands cleared, leveled, inclosed, and drained; with its turnpikes and railroads, its churches, school-houses, colleges, court-houses, market-houses, furnaces, and forges; its coal, iron, and copper mines, and the thousands and tens of thousands of other improvements required for bringing into activity those powers for the use of which rent is paid, and it will be found that it would require the labor of millions of men for centuries, even though provided with all the machinery of modern times—the best ax, the best plow, the steam-engine, the railway, and the locomotive. . . .

The cash value of farms in the State of New York was returned by the marshal under the last Census (1858) at $554,000,000, and adding thereto the value of roads, buildings, and other works of improvement, we shall obtain a sum probably double the amount—or the equivalent of the labor of a million of men working three hundred days in the year for four years, and receiving a dollar a day for their labor. Were the land restored to the condition in which it stood in the days of Hendrick Hudson, and presented in free gift to an association of the greatest capitalists of Europe, with a bonus in money equal to its present value, their private fortunes and the bonus would be found to be exhausted before the existing improvements had been even to the extent of one fifth executed.—*Principles of Social Science*, vol. i, pp. 164–6.

Numerous and striking illustrations are furnished, showing that land in itself has no value any more than air, water, and sunshine; and that, therefore, it is no exception to the general law before enunciated. The present value of every thing is never more than what it would cost to reproduce it in its present condition.

But while Mr. Carey furnishes abundant and convincing evidence from the facts that the value of land is not greater than the amount of labor requisite to bring it to its present condition, there are two points in which he fails to meet the demands of his subject. In the first place he does not explain, or even notice, the fact, that while, for instance, a farm may be of no value to-day beyond the labor hitherto expended upon it, that labor has produced other results not obviously taken into the account. The owner of the farm may, by his labor thereon, have produced not only sustenance for himself and family, and the wherewithal to stock his farm and provide all the various implements for successfully cultivating his land, but he may also have acquired enough to invest more than the worth of his estate in bank stock, railroad or factory shares,

or other profitable property. So that much may, after all, have been produced by labor on the land which has not gone to add to its value—much has come from the farm which can in no way be included in the estimate of its present value. It is true that this is susceptible of explanation, and the fact, in any case, does not vitiate the argument; but it would have been far more satisfactory had all the facts been taken into the account.

The other point is, where, after stating the views of Adam Smith, M'Culloch, Say, Senior, Ricardo, and Mill concerning the two causes of value in land, he fails to clearly expose and refute the doctrine of "monopoly value," as he calls it, maintained by these writers, as additional to the labor value. As exhibited by him, it may be that to the minds of some the doctrine refutes itself; but certainly to others it does not, and in reference to it the author seems to assume a position not thoroughly established by any reasoning of his own, and which many may be inclined to doubt.

The doctrine of Ricardo on rent is substantially as follows: The first settlers in a new country select and occupy the best land. As there will naturally be an abundance of this, more indeed than can be cultivated, there will be no rent. But when, with the increase of population, the first quality is all occupied, that of an inferior quality will begin to be taken up. Rent will then be demanded for land of the better quality, because it will be more profitable to pay something for the latter than to use the former without pay. But when the second quality is all occupied the third quality is resorted to, and the second begins to command rent and to be of value. So on to the very poorest soils that can by any process be made available. Situation and some other collateral circumstances modify the rule in a greater or less degree, but this is the general principle which has held sway for many years with a large class of teachers of political economy. It appears plausible, and, on the face of it, quite conclusive. The inference is not unnatural, and, were we to trust to *à priori* speculation alone, it would no doubt be generally acquiesced in. But applying to it the test of facts, the theory seems to be alarmingly defective. It is not only not generally true, but it is scarcely true in any particular case. Mr. Carey shows, by examples from

almost all countries and in all ages, that new settlements and occupations of land have begun, not with the richest and most productive lands, but the poorer and more sterile. In our own country, for instance, the early settlements of English colonists were the barren, hilly regions of New England. Not only so, but not even the richer soils of that in no respect very fertile section were first occupied. Some of the most productive portions of Massachusetts were not cultivated till years after most of the more sterile parts had been thickly populated; in fact, some of the richest soil in the State remains to this day uncultivated in the midst of the densest population on the continent. The lands there which are now the most productive of any that *are* cultivated have only come under cultivation within the last half century. The same is true of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York. The early settlers took such lands as they could most easily subdue and most readily put under tillage, and these were not the rich, heavy-soiled bottom lands, but the lighter soils, which were easily cleared, on the ridges and sides of the hills, or in the vicinity of the coasts. It may be said that these less productive and lighter soils were those nearer the coast, to which the explorer would naturally first come. This was not by any means always the case, and, when it was the case, it will be found, almost invariably, that there were vastly richer soils than those occupied by them left untouched, because the settlers were not strong enough to manage them, while they could manage the lighter but less productive portions.

As the settlements spread from the coast to the interior they almost invariably followed the course of the rivers; not, however, taking up the lands bordering immediately upon the streams, the fertility of which is hardly anywhere excelled, but keeping to the highlands and the hillsides. The reason of this is obvious, but it does not alter the fact. The heavy-timbered country, the deep-soiled meadow lands, in many cases covered with gigantic and luxurious vegetation, presented obstacles to cultivation which the few and feeble colonists were not adequate to overcome. Some of these lands can only be subjugated by a highly civilized society, possessing the advantages and appliances which come only with combination of numbers —the invention of machinery for clearing, ditching, and drain-

ing, without which they could not be made habitable because of the malaria from the rapid decay of profuse vegetable matter on a warm, moist soil.

It may be said that, however this state of things may be in heavily-wooded lands and in the vicinity of the sea-coast, it must be far otherwise in the settlement of the great prairie regions of the West, where the deep, rich soil seems ready for the hand of man, cleared, subdued, and prepared for service every-where. So it would seem, and we can hardly conceive of any prior reason for a different opinion. But here again the facts obstinately refuse to accommodate themselves to any mere speculative deductions, no matter how reasonable. It may be all the worse for the facts, but they tell their own story and stick to it. Even were it otherwise, it might be shown that the savages had done much by their annual burnings to clear away the forests and change the woodland into prairie, making an exceptional case. But there is no need even to say this; for all through the West it is found that the early settlers selected the higher lands, inferior in their productive capacity to the lower; and it is only latterly, and in many cases not at all as yet, that the most fertile soils have been taken up. In Wisconsin the first settlements at Green Bay, Prairie du Chien, Blue Mound, etc., were by no means in the most fertile portions of the State, and almost all the older towns are on the higher ridges and the thinner soils, the richest prairie regions having been for a long time avoided. On the Ohio River, Wheeling, Marietta, North Bend, Limestone, and Vevay, the first town sites, are in the poorer agricultural regions on the river. In Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi, the sandy plains and pine barrens were occupied long before the almost incomparably more productive portions. The same is true of Texas and Mexico. Mr. Carey pursues the subject into almost every civilized and semi-civilized country of the world, and finds the same fact conspicuous in all. In none of them as a general rule, and the particular exceptions are few, are the most productive soils first occupied.

The facts conflicting so squarely and obstinately with the theory of Ricardo, the latter must involve some false philosophy. We find that what before appeared so natural a rea-

son for a supposed state of things is no reason at all, and that, in fact, there is no such state of things.

The rent of land arises not from any monopoly of its owners, nor from any comparative original richness of the soil, but from the labor put into it, on it, or around it; in its proximity to a market; in the facilities of communication by roads, railways, steamboats; in the character of the community and its institutions; in the degree of civilization, and the productive facilities of society as a whole. In a word, it is in proportion to the value of MAN, which, in a healthy civilization, is always increasing.

The doctrine of Malthus concerning population has been maintained by a large number of prominent thinkers on social subjects both in England and in this country, and is even now defended by living writers of great fame. If the doctrine be false, it is marvelous, notwithstanding its plausibility, how it could have obtained so large a following; if it be true, the marvel is still greater. The doctrine is substantially as follows: Population tends to increase in a geometrical ratio, while the supplies of food can increase in an arithmetical one only. The former is, therefore, perpetually outstripping the latter, and the result necessarily follows of over-population, with its concomitants of poverty, wretchedness, starvation, and death. There is no remedy except, on the one hand, war, pestilence, and famine, to take off the surplus; or, on the other hand, the *moral restraint* by which men and women refrain from matrimony and its natural consequences, and thus avoid this dangerous excess of population.

Mr. Carey, putting his own estimate of its meaning upon it, reduces it to the following distinct propositions:

1. Matter tends to take upon itself higher forms, passing from the simple ones of inorganic life to the complex and beautiful ones of vegetable and animal life, and finally terminating in man.

2. This tendency exists in a small degree as relates to the lower forms of life—matter tending to take upon itself the forms of potatoes, turnips, and cabbages, herrings and oysters—in an arithmetical ratio only.

3. When, however, we reach the highest of all the forms of which matter is capable, we find the tendency to assume that form augmenting in a geometrical ratio; as a consequence of which, while man tends to increase as 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, and 32, the potatoes

and cabbages, the peas and turnips, the herrings and the oysters, increase as 1, 2, 3, and 4 only—producing the result that the highest form is perpetually outstripping the lower ones, and causing the disease of over-population.—*Principles of Social Science*, vol. i, pp. 91, 92.

This would be, as our author shows, to set aside or reverse a natural law in accordance with which, every-where else, "the increase in number is in the inverse ratio of development."

J. Stuart Mill assures us that there is a limit to the productiveness of the earth. This limit he admits has never been reached. In all countries there is much land not now productive that may yet be made so, and perhaps no land has yet exhausted its capability of increased productiveness. The limit cannot be fixed at a determinable point. It is not so much like the obstacle presented by a wall, as like a highly elastic band "which is hardly ever so violently stretched that it cannot be stretched any more, yet the pressure of which is felt long before the final limit is reached, and felt more severely the nearer that limit is approached." The general law of this limitation is thus stated:

> After a certain, and not very advanced, stage in the process of agriculture; as soon, in fact, as mankind have applied themselves to cultivation with any energy, and have brought to it any tolerable tools; from that time it is the law of production from the land, that in any given state of agricultural skill and knowledge, by increasing the labor the produce is not increased in an equal degree. Doubling the labor does not double the produce; or, to express the same thing in other words, every increase in produce is obtained by a more than proportional increase in the application of labor to the land.—*Mill's Political Economy*, book i, chap. xii, § 2.

Mr. Mill calls this "the most important proposition in political economy." It is quite in harmony with the Malthusian theory of population, and is, perhaps, its main underlying principle. Yet Mr. Mill himself admits that it is largely neutralized by an antagonizing principle found in "the progress of society;" that is, in the improved methods of labor and new inventions of machinery, and other appliances by which the effects of labor are so mightily multiplied. This concession nullifies his whole argument. Still he stoutly maintains the fact of such limitation, and that sooner or later it must be reached.

Now, if there be such a limit as is implied in the above proposition, and if also there be *no* natural limit to the geometrical increase of mankind, there is evidently a serious state of things in preparation for the race. It would also appear that one natural law had been made to work in such violent opposition to another natural law as to produce the most disastrous and distressing results, unless resort is had to an unnatural remedy. As there is no other instance in the whole range of Providence or nature where such bungling journeywork is discernible, we conclude that there must be some mistake in the reasoning of those who think they have observed any such conflicting and badly acting laws.

Were this only a speculative opinion or a theory, the application of which could take place only in the remote and indefinite future, it might be of less practical consequence, though we should still have a distressing anxiety lest it might somehow prove true. But it has been pressed as a practical doctrine, already applying itself extensively in society. It is assumed that in many highly-civilized communities multitudes in the past have perished because of over-population, and the hypothesis is made to account for a large proportion of the social ills which even now afflict humanity. This, too, when, according to the confession of its advocates, the productive powers of the earth have nowhere—not even in the most populous countries—been exhausted, nor yet has all the productive land been cultivated.

Plainly, then, we do not believe Mr. Mill's "most important proposition in political economy." It is contrary to all past history and all current experience. If any thing in the whole realm of natural and social law is capable of clear proof, it is that as man acquires a knowledge of nature, and the ability to turn that knowledge to account, he more and more becomes the master of nature. With less and less effort on his part she pours forth more and more of her treasures for his use; and in a wisely-ordered state of society the resources requisite to the sustentation of man would increase faster than the numbers of the race, and that, too, without any resort to unnatural means to check the progress of population. Still, if it be true that the race when acting without artificial restraints, and not limited by the law of proportionably diminishing suste-

nance, increases in geometrical ratio, it is evident that, however small be the ratio, the time must come when, whatever be the increased productiveness of the soil, it will fail to meet the demand. The population will reach a point where there will not be even standing-room upon the face of the ground, in which case it is hard to tell how the earth could possibly produce any thing. Sustentation must then stop, or wholesale cannibalism ensue!

But where can there be found any adequate evidence of this law of uniform geometrical increase of population? Facts certainly furnish no grounds for such an induction. Abstract speculation may demand that the facts should thus shape themselves, but hitherto they invariably refuse to do so. Whether this makes it worse for the facts or the hypothesis we do not decide; but history testifies clearly that nothing is more variable than the increase of population, and that this variation is not due to calculable peculiarities or circumstances; that want of food is not a greater check upon the numerical development of a population than some far from disagreeable conditions of life. We do not mean to say that certain degrees of poverty and certain states of society are not unfavorable to increase, nor that certain others are not favorable; but that there are higher and controlling principles not always discernible, and therefore not permitting the induction of a definite law.

Nature—which is only the divine method of operation—always works toward its own ends by its own rules or laws. These are not necessarily discernible by the human mind; yet we may at least see that they are in perfect harmony each with every other throughout nature's whole domain. A large range of observation is necessary in order to ascertain all the elements which enter into a general law, and sometimes the field is too large for the mind to traverse it. By reason of this our calculations may indicate a conflict in nature's operations. But the conflict is always in the calculations and not in the operations. Nature never contradicts herself. She may do at one time what she does not at another. It is because the demand is made at one time which is not made at another. Thus if a bone is broken she hastens to supply in larger measure than she is wont to do what is needful to repair the fracture. If

there is a lesion of muscle or membrane anywhere, she meets the extraordinary demand by an extraordinary supply. If there are boils or other running sores, manifold more fluids will be secreted than are ordinarily needed or furnished.

So in the increase of population; if from any cause there has been an extraordinary depletion in any community by war, pestilence, or famine, the subsequent rate of increase will be larger than before. If the fatality has been greater to one sex than the other, the balance will be restored by a larger proportion in the births of that sex. The instances which might be cited in illustration of this point are numerous, and some of them almost startling in their character. In respect to human fecundity, as in all other respects, nature adapts her operations to circumstances. At one time it is greatly increased, and at another as largely diminished; and this not capriciously or lawlessly, but in accordance with principles which, though subject to a thousand contingencies and manifold complications, yet evince their existence even when not quite determinable. Thus that the American Indian tribes do not now, and did not at the time of the discovery of the continent by Europeans, increase in geometrical ratio, is a very well established fact. That this lack of increase did not arise from the "pressure of population" upon subsistence is equally well established, for there was no such pressure, the births being remarkably few. In the central portions of the continent and in the South Sea Islands there was no rapid increase of population, though nature was more than lavish in her supplies of food. Yet the causes of this smallness or lack of increase, though in both cases quite opposite to what should have been attributed by the Malthusian theory, were yet altogether different each from the other. In the one it was natural indifference induced by peculiar habits of life and outward conditions; in the other it was general dissoluteness and unbridled license, together with infanticide, violence, and other immoral habits. In neither is the cause to be found in the "moral restraint" which is proposed as the sole remedy for over-population, nor in the inability of the earth to supply the wants of a multiplied population, but solely in the vice and crime and ignorance of man. So one shall find in almost every part of the uncivilized world that the population is kept down, as it is kept down, not

by the failure of the earth to yield an adequate supply for greater numbers, and in no case by the superior *virtue* of the people, but by the folly and by the sin of man.

Approaching civilized communities, we find that, in general, up to a certain point, as the people come under the dominion of moral principles, and as the power of association and its necessary concomitant human individuality become developed, a constant increase in the growth of the population follows. There is also a still greater and not less constant increase in the amount and utility of the productions of the earth. The growth of population is due not to the greater number of births, for probably the number is on the whole considerably less, but to the preservation of the lives of those that are born, and the increase of the average of human life by better care, more and better food and clothing, and improvements in medical science. In France, for instance, as a recent writer shows, within the recent times, since property has been more generally diffused, although the number of births is decreasing the population is increasing more rapidly than before. Yet in France, as in England and elsewhere in the Old World, the great masses of the people are still placed at a fearful disadvantage.

But will this increase continue indefinitely? and if so, shall we not, after all, sooner or later, incur all the horrors implied in the Malthusian theory? We have already seen that there is no uniform law of increase; and from what we have already noted of the operations of nature, we are warranted in assuming that some way would be provided to adjust the growth of population to the supplies of sustenance, and that, too, without any resort to unnatural methods. We may also get some glimpses of what that way is.

One law of animal increase is, that the lower in the scale of organization any order of beings is the greater the fecundity. "The queen ant of the African termites lays 80,000 eggs, and the hair-worm as many as 8,000,000 in a single day." "Above 1,000,000 eggs are produced at once by a single codfish, whereas in the strong and sagacious shark but few are found." The lower forms of mammalia produce numerous litters; but as the species rise in character and intelligence the number decreases, till we reach the elephant, the least prolific of all. We have seen that there are innumerable vicious elements in the charac-

ter of man which modify and complicate the discernible laws that govern him in his social relations, and especially in this of the increase of his kind. Laying all these as far as may be out of the account, we shall find that up to a certain point population increases more rapidly in a civilized than in a savage state of society, not because of greater fecundity in the former than in the latter, but because of the more careful preservation of life; and that, however rapid this increase of population, the increase of the means of sustenance is still more rapid. We have also reason to infer that when that point is reached we shall find the more obvious operation of the law just referred to, by virtue of which the higher the development the less the procreative tendency, other things being equal. Thus the very progress of society in numbers, wealth, and development provides a natural check and easy adjustment without the mediation of artificial and unnatural restraints.

In evidence of this law of high development as antagonistic to fecundity, we need only refer to the fact patent to every observer, that men of great intellectual activity leave small and feeble families or none at all. Of "the first fifteen occupants of the Presidential chair in this country, seven have been entirely childless, while the total number of their children has been but little more than twenty." Alexander, Cesar, Napoleon, Wellington, the Foxes, Pitts, Berzelius, Fourcroy, Davy, Franklin, Calhoun, Webster, and many others of eminence whom we might mention, "have not as a rule left behind them children enough to fill the void created by their decease."

Twenty years since the number of British peers was 354, of whom no less than 272 were the result of creations subsequent to 1760. From 1611 to 1819 no less than 753 baronetcies had become extinct; and yet the total number created had been less than 1,400. Facts precisely similar to these are found on looking to the noble families of Europe generally, "Amelot," as we are told by Addison, "having reckoned in his time 2,500 nobles who had voices in the council," whereas there were not, at the time he wrote, more than 1,500, "notwithstanding the admission of many new families since that time. It is very strange," as he continues, "that with this advantage, they are not able to keep up their number, considering that the nobility spread through all the brothers, and that so very few are destroyed in the wasr of the republic."—*Social Science*, vol. iii, pp. 306, 307.

We find similar illustrations in the history of Rome, and other countries ancient and modern. In the large cities and many sections of our own country we find the families of the ignorant foreign laborers multiplying with what to some seems alarming rapidity, till they threaten in some localities to out-populate the descendants of American-born citizens. The complaint made a short time since concerning the facts revealed by the vital statistics of Massachusetts is a case in point. It was looked upon as an alarming symptom that the old Puritan element was disappearing under the influence of this out-populating force of the lower class of foreigners. It only shows that as families, as well as nations, advance in civilization there is a natural diminution of the procreative tendency. No doubt there are some vicious causes for this diminution in many cases, but these can only in small measure account for the whole. There is a natural law beneficently governing the subject, and this law, and that of the increase of sustenance, will harmoniously adjust themselves each to the other.

The distinction between *trade* and *commerce* in the work before us is peculiar and worthy of notice. The difference, though urged with considerable vehemence, and reiterated in various forms every-where in the work, is still not made so obvious in its definite statement as is desirable. Yet to the confusion existing on this subject, and the vicious substitution of one for the other, is rightly attributed much of the disorder extant in society. Substantially the difference is this: *Commerce* consists in the exchange of commodities or of ideas by men *with one another; trade* is the exchange which some men perform *for other men.* Commerce is essential to society. There can, of course, be neither society nor commerce where a man is isolated, nor where two men live in the same neighborhood, each producing the same kind and amount of commodities, material or immaterial, or where each produces all that he consumes and no more. A painful illustration of this lack of society between individuals living in the closest proximity, yet having nothing to impart to each other, is found in the story of two prisoners confined in the same cell, who were at first companionable and helpful to the relief of each other's solitude. But after a time their conversation began to slacken, gradually it became infrequent, and finally wholly ceased. Each had acquired all the other

had to give. There was no material for exchange; commerce ceased, and with it society. It is when one man in some way supplements another that commerce begins, that the social man emerges. The solitary settler, dependent for his supplies upon his powers of appropriation, compelled to wander over extensive surfaces, even though they be of exceeding fertility, yet finds himself not unfrequently in danger of perishing from hunger.

"Even when successful, he is compelled to intermit his search, and provide for effecting *the change of place* required for bringing his food, his miserable habitation, and himself together. There arrived, he is forced to be, in turn, cook and tailor, mason and carpenter. Deprived of artificial light, his nights are wholly useless, while his power productively to apply his days is dependent altogether upon the weather." But if he finds after awhile that he has a neighbor, exchanges take place between them, each being almost certain to have acquired more than he needs of something of which the other is destitute. But this commerce is at first beset with difficulties—distance, it may be, irregularity in their respective supplies, small variety of acquisition, etc. In order to commerce at all, there must be, as we have seen, difference. Two farmers, both of whom raise only wheat, can have no exchanges with each other—there is no society. Hence, the more numerous the differences, the more lively the commerce, the greater the societary circulation; and the greater this is, again, the greater the development of individuality and difference, resulting in increase of association and commerce. Hence, society in its normal condition is characterized by a constantly accelerated motion, a constantly increasing productiveness, and increasing capability of combination, and, at the same time, increased individuality, which again promotes anew the societary action, making it even more effective.

Trade is an instrument, and within its proper limits a necessary instrument, of commerce. Our author, while admitting this, represents the two as in antagonism. We cannot help thinking that much of his teaching on this subject is calculated to mislead. The one always declines, he says, as the other grows in power. In a certain and important sense this may be true. Yet it is not universally and every way true. On

the principle of the division of labor there must be a class of exchangers. They are just as essential and profitable to society as any other class of workers. If all men were left to make direct exchanges of their own productions there would be an incalculable waste of time for which the community would be vastly poorer. Trade thus becomes a great labor-saving machine, whose utility is quite as obvious as that of any other.

In so far as trade tends to keep men apart, and to interpose a great number of agents and middlemen between producers and consumers, just to that extent it diminishes the profits of both; it also abates the amount of variety of production, and is thus antagonistic to commerce, and therefore, of course, to society and all its interests. If on the opposite sides of an island two hundred miles in diameter two colonies should settle, one of which should be composed principally of shoemakers and producers of cotton and wool, and the other of manufacturers of cloth and raisers of cattle, if a navigable river should afford communication between each and some central locality there would spring up a mercantile town to which the respective wares of the two colonies would be sent for exchange. This would be of great advantage to both the remote communities so long as there was a necessity that each should confine itself to its original kind of production. But it would be better, supposing there were equal facilities in each for each kind of production, for some of the wool and cotton growers to go from the one colony to the other, and for some of the cloth-makers of the latter to pass over to the former, in order that both communities might be supplied without the expense of transportation and of the large commissions paid to exchangers and middlemen. Not only would there be this increase of prosperity to the several communities, but as diversity of occupation tends to create still greater diversity, and prosperity opens the way to greater prosperity, new industries would be evolved and the societary circulation become more rapid, preparing the way for more numerous exchanges between the two colonies, where short-sighted policy might have prophesied an entire cessation. The trader would still be in demand—probably greater than before—but the proportionate demand would be far less than before. Now, suppose that the government of the island should enact a law that

no manufacture of cloth should take place in the one colony, nor any culture of wool or cotton in the other, and that this should be done in the interest of the emporium. This would be sacrificing commerce to trade to the detriment of all the interests of society. Yet this, in reality, though not often in form, is what has been done over and over again in the history of the world.

The whole tendency both of the past and the present to draw all exchanges to great cities is a great evil. This enormous centralization of trade is antagonistic to the interests of commerce, which is to be promoted by building up local centers in all parts of every producing country of any considerable extent. Great cities are sometimes said to be great sores upon the body politic, centers of corruption and various hideous evils. If they are in some sense necessary, things being as they are—though as they should not be—they are also in some sense unnatural, and therefore necessarily unhealthy.

We have examples of the evil of the policy of trade in its antagonism to healthy commerce when a nation not only discourages manufactures in her colonies and dependencies, but uses all possible means to break down the industries of other nations to prevent their competition with her own. Of this England is a notable example. She aspires to become the workshop of the nations, and endeavors to prevent commerce within and between them in order that she may do their trading and tax their profits. This policy reacts upon those who use it, as every selfish and unnatural policy must. The social evils which curse England to-day are the certain, if not the direct, result of her endeavor to avert by unjust methods whatever inconveniences might have been involved in equitable dealings both with her own laboring classes and her sister nations. Within the last ninety years the population of England has nearly trebled. But the number of land-owners has diminished from 200,000 to less than 35,000, and the small proprietors have nearly disappeared. The independence of the laboring population has decreased by reason of the vast competition among laborers, and the avowed policy of both capitalists and statesmen to make labor cheap. By discouraging manufactures in Ireland she has occasioned an immense im-

migration from that island, overcrowding the labor-market, allowing manufacturers and corporations to procure work at the lowest possible wages at which starvation can be avoided, increasing the burden of pauperism to a frightful extent, and leading to various schemes of emigration and much theorizing concerning "the evils of over-population."

In communities where trade is not the absorbing feature of the social economy, where, as far as possible, commerce is direct between the various producers, and where the middlemen who produce nothing, yet appropriate a large proportion of the productions of others, are reduced to the smallest possible number, a more healthy state of things would prevail. Labor would be in a continually rising market, means of sustenance would increase more rapidly than the population, great monopolies would be avoided, capitalists would have less illegitimate advantage over laborers, great overgrown central cities would shrink to their proper proportions, local centers would multiply and flourish, agriculture keep pace with other pursuits—which other pursuits would be subsidiary to agriculture—waste lands be reclaimed and cultivated, all soils rendered more productive, and man be more free, intelligent, and spiritual.

The policy of bringing the producer and consumer, or rather the different kinds of producers, into as close proximity to each other as possible, is generally acknowledged to be a correct one. Yet there are many who, while admitting it in the abstract, deny it in the concrete. One of our eminent writers on this subject argues against certain measures to produce this proximity, that by diminishing the necessity of transportation we destroy or impair some important branches of industry. Yet he would probably not advocate the maintaining of any business simply because it furnishes occupation to a certain number of workers. All the transporting and trading agencies in the world are only remedies for certain defects in the social system. They are not elements of power only as they supply these defects. When the latter no longer exist the former may be profitably dismissed. No one thinks of taking medicine to prevent its being wasted, or to employ a physician to keep the latter from starving. There are some who tell us that it is better that there should be a division of the various industries among

the different communities and nations on the same principle as that which makes division of labor among individuals desirable. They forget that the demand for a division of labor among individuals exists in just those points where the mutual relations of individuals differ from those of communities. The beneficial effects of exchange and the feeling of interdependence among nations are urged as having important and salutary ethical bearings. This is philosophical, but it does not prove that the good of the individual is to be sacrificed to the advancement of society. The latter is only an instrument of the former, and therefore subordinate to it. The maintenance of close commercial relations between nations is an important point to be gained. But it is of far higher importance to maintain the most complete commerce between the individuals of the several communities. It is obvious, too, that here as elsewhere in social relations the superior law implies the inferior. Between two communities in each of which internal commerce is made paramount to external, the exchanges, other things being equal, will be vastly greater than between two where external commerce is regarded as the chief thing. France presents a good illustration. Thirty-five years ago it was confidently predicted that by the measures she was then adopting to promote domestic industry and internal commerce her foreign trade would be ruined. Yet her exports within less than thirty years had nearly trebled, while her internal policy had been marvelously successful.

Of two towns fifty miles apart, the agricultural facilities of which were the same, no one would advocate that all the farmers in the one should exclusively cultivate corn and those of the other potatoes, for the sake of promoting commerce between them, nor for any other purpose. Nor is there any reason why all the carpenters should reside in one county, and all the blacksmiths in another a score or two of miles away, while no farmers should be allowed in either. The commerce of these separate localities would obviously be less than if all the occupations were found in both communities; and if there were any natural or artificial obstacle to the introduction of the absent occupations, it would be money well laid out that was expended in removing them. In almost every community there are some industries that cannot be profitably carried on

in others. Corn can be raised in one locality and not in another. Tea, coffee, spices, wheat, sugar, and various fruits, have their peculiar soils and climates. So there are certain manufactures which, owing to peculiar proximity of material or other advantages, can be prosecuted in one place better than in another. There are enough of these differences of industrial facilities in different communities and nations to answer all the beneficent ends of mutual dependence and friendly intercourse.

In every community the greatest possible diversity of employment should be sought. Only thus can there be any considerable degree of prosperity. God has so constituted society that the more it is developed by civilization and education the more widely diverse is it in its tastes, aptitudes, capabilities, and capacities; and unless these are met by corresponding diversities of occupation, there will be a proportional waste of human power. If in any community all the children are expected to grow up to a particular trade, while other trades are ignored or kept at the minimum, there will be large numbers who, having no taste nor inclination for this, and no opportunities for any thing else, will either be inefficient, thriftless workers, with no enthusiasm or interest in their vocation, or mere drones and idlers, or vagabonds and criminals. There is thus a great waste of manhood, and an incalculable loss of productive power. It has been supposed by some that the introduction of new industries will proportionally diminish the productiveness of those already existing. But facts testify to the contrary. The manufactures of France within the last century have advanced from an insignificant amount till they alone amount to nearly double the whole product of the country at the beginning of the period. But instead of diminishing the agricultural product, this has trebled in that time, while the population has increased only about sixty per cent. This, too, is somewhat in antagonism with the Malthusian doctrine of population. The same kinds of facts appear in Belgium, Germany, and elsewhere. One remarkable thing appears here which appear so often to the careful student of social science that it ceases at length to be remarkable. It is that while there is less necessity for foreign commerce when the internal societary circulation is kept at its maximum, the amount is far greater. Mr. Carey shows in an interesting

manner that this is one of the grand natural laws of society, every-where evincing its operation—the powers of man being in inverse ratio to his necessities—the more completely he masters nature, the more abundantly she ministers to him; but in proportion as he is inferior to her, the more he needs of her help and the less of that help she gives.

We have not attempted an analysis or description of Mr. Carey's system—only touching upon a few of the more prominent topics which come under discussion in his elaboration of the subject. The philosophy is simple, as all true philosophies are. It is comprehended in a nutshell, yet its ramifications are vast and complicated, and through them all it meets the conditions at every point, evincing a delightful harmony in its application.

In the study of this subject we have been more forcibly struck than ever before by its moral bearings. After all, what is wanted is not so much a correct social theory, and larger information, though these are sadly wanting; but religious principle, uprooting and destroying the deeply-planted selfishness of human nature, and putting in its place the disposition to do justice, to exercise benevolence, to "honor all men," and to apply the principles of the New Testament to human society. Christianity is the best cure for all the social evils which are extant in the world.

Art. II.—THEODORE PARKER.

Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. By John Weiss. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.
Miss Cobbe's Edition of Parker's Works. London: Trübner & Co.

At this point it may be as well to examine the theological position of Mr. Parker and have done with it. It remains to see whether he has been able to set up any thing self-consistent and tenable in room of the ancient and divine revelations which he labored to destroy.

The three great doctrines of religion which Parker proclaims are these: "The instinctive intuition of God; the instinctive intuition of justice, or a moral law which we are bound to

obey,... and the instinctive intuition of immortality." His account of these ideas is so strange as to merit careful examination. They are "primal intuitions of human nature, which depend on no logical process of demonstration, but are rather facts of consciousness given by the instinctive action of human nature itself."

It is not exactly clear whether Mr. Parker had any very definite notions in his own mind, which he here failed to embody in accurate language; but it is unfortunate that he should have employed, to characterize our primal cognitions of God, a philosophic term which he does not employ in its ordinary and received signification. The discrimination of intuitive knowledge from knowledge obtained through logical processes has been drawn with great care, and has become quite clear. There is some difference in details between Kant, Hamilton, Cousin, M'Cosh, and others in the discussion of this topic, but there is no real difference among them as to the logical marks or tests of intuitions. These marks or notes are: self-evidence, necessity, and catholicity. Parker certainly had some notion of the true character of these primary cognitions of the human intellect, since, after classing his three great dogmas among them, he transfers one of their most striking peculiarities, namely, independence of logical processes, to those dogmas. But he should have known that his right to place these three great doctrines of absolute religion among the objects of intuition would be disputed. Hence it was incumbent on him to show that they bear the proper notes of *à priori*, or intuitional, ideas. This procedure alone could give some show of stability to his scheme of doctrine. Here Parker puts assumption for proof.

Let us test his right to make so serious an assumption in regard to the fundamental question of theology, the existence of God. Has he, then, the right, in philosophy, to assume that man knows God by direct intuition? Kant finds the marks of *à priori*, or intuitive, truths to be "necessity and strict universality." When we find ourselves compelled to think of any proposition as necessary, not derived from any other, and also as admitting no exceptions, this indicates that the source of its cognition is *à priori*, or intuitive. Such is the constant teaching of Kant on this subject. Of course, he could not

class among such ideas those of God and immortality. Indeed, he undertakes precisely the reverse in case of the former. His attempt is to show that the various possible arguments for the existence of God are untenable in strict philosophy. Certainly, had Kant deemed these propositions *à priori* ones, carrying with them the idea of their own necessity and universality, he would have smiled at any attempt to prove them. Instead of dismissing these arguments with a smile, as unneeded and impertinent, Kant devotes many pages to a careful examination of them, and he ends with a formal denial of their value. Hear his precise words: "It may be very well allowed *to admit* the existence of a being of the highest efficiency as cause of all possible effects, in order to facilitate for reason the unity of the grounds of explanation which it seeks. But to go so far beyond as that we should even say, *such a being exists necessarily*, is no longer the modest assertion of an allowable hypothesis, but the bold pretension of an apodictical certainty; for, as to that which we give out to be known as absolutely necessary, the cognition thereof must likewise carry along with it absolute necessity."

I am not concerned now with the validity of Kant's refutation of all possible arguments for the divine existence. For my present purpose it is enough that he, in this passage, plainly denies Parker's right to class our primal cognition of God among intuitive and necessary ideas. Even when Kant admits that man's conscience and the moral laws postulate a God, he takes care to add that this is true only in a practical way.

Cousin, in the chapter on the origin of principles, gives in substance the same tests as the sage of Königsberg of intuitional cognitions, and the entire drift of his philosophy is in sharp opposition to Parker's assumption. It is of intuitive truth that Cousin says: "We try to doubt the truth which we perceive, we attempt to deny it, we are not able to do it, and then it is presented to reflection as superior to all possible negation; it appears to us no longer as a truth, but as a necessary truth." Now it is only needful to read the fourth and fifth lectures of Cousin's "Introduction to the History of Philosophy" to discover that he could not class the existence of God among these primary cognitions of the mind.

Hamilton had openly committed himself to such views, but I shall not quote the remarkable language in which he sets forth the steps necessary to be taken in proving the divine existence, because his "Lectures on Metaphysics" were not published till the year of Parker's death.

What has been cited above from the most eminent of German philosophers and from the ablest of French writers in this realm must serve to show how clearly it was incumbent on Parker to vindicate the intuitional quality of our cognition of God. When a thinker gives us only three great cardinal dogmas of absolute religion, and assumes that these are all objects of direct intuition with mankind, it certainly is somewhat startling to find the ablest philosophical writers of his period against him.

But Parker further claims that these grand primary intuitions (which are not all intuitions) are "given by the instinctive action of human nature itself." Instinctive is a vague term, and is apt to be a lurking-place of false meanings and no-meanings. Like charity, it is pretty sure to cover a multitude of sins. The most general notion conveyed by the word is, that it stands somehow opposed to the rational faculty in its processes, while it nevertheless agrees with reason in its results. Man builds under the guidance of reason, the bird and the bee under the impulse of instinct; yet each builds well. Instinct is supposed to have no variety in its action, while reason has a wider range of operation; yet instinct is held to work more accurately within its narrow scope than reason in its broader sweep. Hence a recent philosopher has defined instinct as an "agent which performs blindly and ignorantly a work of intelligence." If Parker's language have any meaning, then it would imply that in some mysterious process wherein man is an "agent which performs blindly and ignorantly a work of knowledge," his intuitive powers give him a direct cognition of God, a moral law and immortality. We resign the interpretation of this mystification to Mr. Weiss.

Of course we have no objection to the statement that we gain our earliest notions of the good and evil of human actions from intuition. From such concrete instances of moral good and evil as we encounter, we easily generalize the moral law which we are bound to observe. But we are compelled to

object to the derivation of these notions from the instinctive action of our nature. We cannot see that Parker attaches any clear meaning to his own words; and we can see that our intuitive perceptions are among the clearest of our mental operations, while our instinctive operations have something blind, ignorant, and mysterious ever hanging about them. The two words cannot properly be applied to the same thing, since each excludes the other. What is self-evident, necessary, and universally true cannot well be a work of blind and ignorant intelligence. Hence such language as Parker's on this most awful theme could only spring from a gross confusion of thought.

It may seem useless to dwell upon the philosophical errors of a writer who shows so little power of clear and consecutive thinking; but our task requires this further tax upon the reader's patience.

Having expounded the origin of these three great doctrines of religion with such fortunes as we have seen, Mr. Parker tells us that he "went on to develop the contents of our consciousness of God, of justice, and of immortality." Thus he sought to learn "what God is, what morality is, and what immortality has to offer." In the unfinished work on "The Development of Religion," which occupied so much of Parker's time and thoughts down to his death, but which remained a mere fragment at last, a statement is found which no doubt gives us his maturest notions of the being of God. After dwelling upon the cosmological, teleological, ontological, and psychological arguments for the existence of God, he says:

> All these various arguments are attempts of mankind to legitimate by the intellect what is given as a fact of consciousness, and what it seems to me is not attainable by any of the modes enumerated. Reasoning, I think, will never furnish us with the idea of God, which is a *datum* of spontaneous consciousness, any more than with the idea of cause in itself. But starting with the notion of God, distinguishing it from other notions, developing it by the *à priori* law of intuition, analyzing the facts of intellectual, esthetic, moral, affectional, and religious consciousness, till we separate the infinite element from all the finite, uniting all this together with the one whole Being who is given spontaneously by our nature, we then find that philosophy and nature agree; we have an idea of God which fulfills the conditions of the mind, conscience, heart, soul, taken in their separate activity, and also the conditions of human nature taken in its whole action. . . .

Starting thus with the notion of God as a fact of consciousness intuitively known, examining it, and developing it to its proper conclusion, I then see that the existence of God is a fact of necessity, not merely actual, but uncontingent and necessary as the *à priori* cause of all things, and the reason thereof not the less. If any finite thing exists, say myself, then by the laws of my own nature I am forced to the infinite existence implied therein, and am as certain of that as of my own existence. The only thing I take for granted in the matter is the validity of my own faculties.

Let us examine the nature of God thus authenticated more carefully. I lay off all that is limited and conditioned, and separate the idea of God from the conceptions added to it. Then I eliminate all that is idiosyncratic or peculiar to myself, all that is sectarian and of my own party, all that is national of my tribe, secular of my age. . . . There is left the idea of God the Infinite. . . . God, blank and bare, unclothed by human conditions, . . . a primitive fact of nature, separated from the dust of human consciousness. This is the *Infinite*, the *Absolute*, not conceived as a manifold but a unit; and I call it *a* Being, the absolute Being. Then I examine it in the light of all my several faculties, and I find God is the perfection of existence, self-being, the cause uncaused; the perfection of power, all-mightiness; of will, self-determining; the condition of all things, but conditioned by none; autonomic, with absolute freedom; with the pefection of mind; all-knowingness, not reasoning inducing, deducing, imagining, and remembering, etc., but knowing without process, regardless of our categories and modes of conception, but knowing in forms to me unknown; the perfection of conscience, all-righteousness, all-goodness, goodness unconditioned by motive, as hope, or fear, or self-love; the perfection of affection; the perfection of soul, perfect holiness, fidelity to self. . . . I call this the Supreme Being. . . . I unite all—being and the modes thereof, and call it God.

While I attribute these qualities, I of course conceive of God as immanent in all the modes into which I divided existence, matter, and spirit, but as infinite. I do not put a limit there. God is transcendent. . . . I dare not attribute personality to God lest I invest the Deity with the limitations of my own, ending in anthropomorphism; nor impersonality, lest I thus affix the limitations of mere matter, and abut in Hylism or in Pantheism.

It will furnish a good illustration of Parker's defects as a thinker, and an illustration much needed, too, if we trace out with care the saltatory course of ideas appearing in this quotation. He begins with the idea of God as a *datum* of spontaneous consciousness. Since he makes this idea intuitive in its nature, he ought to show whether it be a primitive cognition, belief, or judgment, and then distinguish it from the other primitive

data of consciousness in its own class. Being a simple *datum* of spontaneous consciousness, he should have remarked that in its earliest apprehension by the mind it could only have the qualities of percepts, and must especially have the quality of self-evidence. Instead of this careful procedure, Parker goes on to say that we are to "develop" this doctrine "by the *à priori* law of intuition." What on earth can be the meaning of all this? When any intuitive *datum* of spontaneous consciousness is before the mind, the mind may observe it, and, if it exhibits the marks of any class of things known to it by previous observation and generalization, the mind may refer the datum to that class. Should it appear *sui generis*, as must be the case with the percept God, the mind may go on observing and recording its observations, and so collect a mass of valuable information on this fact of consciousness. But Mr. Parker would have us "develop" this *datum* "by the *à priori* law of intuition." Development most naturally expresses the total progress of living things from their earliest on to their latest forms of existence. When spoken of an intuitive datum of consciousness, it would seem to mean bringing it into its relations to all other things, making clear its position and connections in the vast concatenation of things under the law of cause and effect, and so reaching its reality or truth. That is probably what Mr. Parker had in mind; if so, however, he was specially unfortunate in adding that this must be done "by the *à priori* law of intuition," since it cannot fall under that law, and can only be effected under the laws of the discursive faculties.

The sentence we have been examining is not yet concluded, but just here we are treated to one of Parker's oft-repeated exploits in intellectual jugglery. The reader will bear us witness, that so far we have been watching Parker's treatment of the idea of God, considered as a *datum* of spontaneous consciousness; our whole business has been with this one *datum*. But the logical magician shakes his wand in the next clause, and tells us that we are now to "analyze the facts of intellectual, esthetic, moral, affectional, and religious consciousness, till we separate the infinite element from the finite." Take a fresh breath, good friends, and steady your whirling wits for this mighty task! Instead of one fact or *datum*, we have now

facts innumerable, under several orders of consciousness, and we are to analyze all these, till we separate the infinite element from all their finite ones. *Per aspera ad astra;* and that is all well enough, so you come *there* at last.

In reference to these "facts of intellectual, esthetic, moral, affectional, and religious consciousness," a remark or two of explanation must be made. Observe, then, that we no longer deal merely with facts of consciousness given in intuition, but with facts of consciousness in general, of the several sorts indicated; that is, instead of being shut up to the comparatively limited field of facts of consciousness known through intuition, we are now to examine all the facts of our personal consciousness and all the facts of human consciousness, of the specified classes, as recorded in human institutions, and exhibited in the various forms wherein man has been able to embody them. This would involve an examination of all systems of religion, politics, art, philosophy, literature, etc., wherein human thought and emotion, of those sorts, has taken on expression; and this process is to proceed till "the infinite element is separated from all the finite" ones contained in these facts. That this is no exaggeration of Parker's intention appears from his saying that, in this way, we may obtain an "idea of God" which "satisfies the conditions of human nature taken in its whole action." It would be vain to protest that no mortal powers are adequate to so immense a task. Parker feels amply competent for it; indeed, the very next clause could not have been honestly written unless he had, or thought he had, sifted these vast stores of facts of consciousness, and thereby separated "the infinite element from the finite in them." For this clause runs thus: "Uniting all this together with the one whole Being who is given spontaneously by our nature, we then find that philosophy and nature agree . . . thus we have a clear and consistent idea of God." "All this process of demonstration makes me no more certain of the existence of God than at the first, as all the demonstration of my own existence, or of the existence of the world, would make me no more sure of either than I was at first." Here again we come upon a direct implication of Parker's prevailing notion, that we know God by intuition or direct contemplation, without the intervention of logical process. Our knowledge of our own existence

is certainly of this sort, and though opinions differ as to whether we know the outward world in this way, the drift of recent philosophy is in favor of the idea. Better evidence could not be desired that Parker meant to class the existence of God among *à priori* truths. But this puts it among truths which are self-evident, necessary, so that when we try to think them false we cannot, and universal, or known to each man as surely as his own existence. It follows that such a truth is above demonstration, like a mathematical axiom; yet here is Parker resorting to analysis of our consciousness, with its multitudinous facts of certain sorts, to *demonstrate* the being of God. Strangely enough, we are told in one sentence that "this process of thought ... *legitimates* before the mind the consciousness of God, which comes spontaneously, and is a part of nature," and in the next that it "makes me no more certain of the existence of God than at first." It is hard to see how a self-evident and necessary truth can require to be legitimated before the mind; and, admitting that it might, even apodictic demonstration in its aid could only afford it the same measure of certainty which it has in itself as a necessary truth; and finally, Mr. Parker's proof being "a process of thought, analysis, synthesis," and a good deal of each, and being founded on facts of human nature that require wide and delicate and long-protracted observation, with inductions carefully grounded on them, so that the avoiding error is hardly possible, it cannot legitimate a necessary truth; for in that case the absolutely certain truth would be legitimated by the almost absolutely uncertain logical process.

It would not be difficult to point out a multitude of similar errors in the remaining discussion of this topic, but I forbear further insistence on this score. Precisely the same general line of remark would be open to us in regard to Parker's assumption that immortality is a truth known through intuition. There is no need to dwell on this point, however, and other matters must be noticed. Among these is his refusal to call God personal or impersonal, with the reasons he assigns. To call God personal would risk, it seems, the fixing upon him our limitations. It is hard to see why calling him being, holy, good, just, intelligent, wise, omniscient, mighty, and the like, should not involve the same peril. The danger does not lurk in this or that particular word, as personality or imper-

sonality; it inheres in all human speech. Human speech takes on its narrowness from the narrowness of our finite thought. Hence, to think of God at all, since we cannot think of him adequately, has the same tendency to affix our limitations to him.

Such are some of the many inconsistencies into which Parker fell in his doctrine of God. Surely the spectacle is an instructive one. Had he been a candid and logical thinker, his urgent difficulties would have enforced on him the necessity of a revelation. It seems hardly possible that Parker could have felt assured of the correctness of his own teachings on this awful topic. There are so many schemes of the universe, so many schools of philosophy, and they differ so much from each other, that I must needs admire the courageous man who would fain impose his opinions of the nature of God on the world as truth! I comprehend the procedure of the humble Christian who reverently accepts the doctrines of the Bible as a divine revelation: he may systematize and organize his knowledge; he may seek to enlarge it by further study; he adds nothing to it, and he sets up his personal authority for nothing. But I am amazed at the daring of a man who never had fine culture and high philosophic talent, whose chief gift was the gift of exaggeration, whose life was largely that of a peripatetic stump-orator, hot with perpetual lecturing, agitating, denouncing, and misrepresenting, when he tries to mold the thoughts of the world on a matter so profound and difficult as this. Let the reader study the treatise of Saisset on "The Existence of God," or his "Refutation of Spinoza," or weigh Caro's admirable discussion of the "Idea of God in Contemporary Criticism," and there mark how inadequate, confused, one-sided, and contradictory have been the thoughts of the greatest of the ancients and the wisest of the moderns on this subject; then I think he must smile with me at the bold men who would substitute the God of speculation for the God of revelation. I am tempted to cry out: You are scientific men, and know so much, and know every thing so certainly, and have never made mistakes, and are always agreed among yourselves; you are so free from prejudices, and to err with you is so much better than to seek wisdom from God; surely ye shall teach the people knowledge! Scarce two of you are

agreed on any thing positive! You are only agreed in denying that a supernatural revelation is possible. Some of you seem sure that the truth is to be found among you; and others say, "Well, nothing is certain, and no matter." Alas, good gentlemen!

How superior to this intellectual pride and self-complacency is the modest temper which true religion inspires in men of the highest faculties. After a truly wonderful statement of the ineffable nature, attributes, and mysteriousness of God, J. H. Newman concludes as follows:

> Thus he is simply incomprehensible to us mortal men. Well might the ancient heathen shrink from answering, when a king, his patron, asked him what God was! He begged for a day to consider his reply; at the end of it, for two more; and when the two were ended, for four besides; for in truth he found that thought, instead of bringing him toward the solution of the question, did but drive him back; the more he questioned, the vaster grew the theme, and when he drew one conclusion, thence issued forth a hundred fresh difficulties to confound his reason. For in truth the being and attributes of God are a subject, not for reason simply, but for faith; and we must accept his own word about himself.

When Mr. Parker tells us that this idea of God is given in human consciousness, that argument does not render us more certain of his existence, he encounters two great historical obstacles. The first is the existence of individual atheists both in ancient and modern times. Have these, then, no direct and intuitive cognition of God, given in the spontaneous action of human nature? Of course they must have, on Parker's theory as to the origin of our primary cognitions of God. Have such people been sufficiently dishonest to deny a truth as plain to all men as their own existence or the existence of the world? Certainly Mr. Parker cannot be so uncharitable toward such singular people. He can lightly question the honesty of Christians, ministers and laymen, by the churchful, but a skeptic is sure of very tender handling from him. He cannot doubt their sincerity. They are, many of them, honest, intelligent, moral, and philanthropic, in his eyes. The abuses of Christian institutions and the open wickedness of the Church have had much to do with the unbelief of these people. But, pray, has any one heard that these causes have led any of them

to doubt his own existence, or to deny that there is a terraqueous globe? Why should such motives lead them to deny one of these rather than the other, if the existence of each has the same philosophic basis? Of course these unhappy people must be disposed of in some way, else they would dispose of Parker's theory of our cognition of God. Parker gently tells them that they are mistaken. Indeed, he does not think that they are really atheists. He thinks that they think that they are atheists, but *he* thinks they are not. Which should know best what his own intuitive powers report to himself, Comte or Parker? Feuerbach or Parker? What would have been his bearing toward any who had taken such liberties with his opinions?

The second and much more important of the historical obstacles to Parker's doctrine of God is the religious system called Buddhism. Before discussing the relation of this religious system to Parker's scheme of doctrine, I wish to show that he claims to have studied it with care. Speaking of his studies in the Divinity School, that era of miracles in his life, he writes:

> I studied the historical development of religion and theology among the nations not Jewish or Christian, and attended as well as I then could to the four other great religious sects, the Brahmanic, the Buddhistic, the Classic, and the Mohammedan. As far as possible at that time, I studied the sacred books of mankind in their original tongues, and with the help of the most faithful interpreters.

It must be noted that Parker says he did all this study in order to find a safe basis for his three great cardinal dogmas of religion. It might perhaps be forgiven him if he had no very accurate knowledge of that religion at so early a period, but one can hardly excuse him for assigning it a character exactly the reverse of its real one, and then resting his theory of religion partly on that false view. Yet this is what he did. He does not tell us what books he read on this subject. Notwithstanding his pompous tone, there is no reason to think that he read any of the sacred books of Buddhism in the original. Nor does he cite "the most faithful interpreters" of that religion who were his guides. In a letter he refers a correspondent to Bournouf as the best authority on Buddhism. Bournouf's famous work was published (at least my copy) in 1844, and

was to be had for good money. Among other things to be done, this is cited by Weiss from Parker's journal under date of August 24, 1853: "Historical Development of Religion. Finish volume two, by September, 1854, if possible, and have it in print." There are ten years between the two dates. Now, Weiss quotes from the manuscript of this same volume two, as follows:

> All nations of the earth at the time of Christ had their formal religion—they all agreed in several things: in a belief in the existence of a God, and of a religious nature in man that has need of religion and has communication with God. They agreed in a third thing: the immortality of the human spirit. . . . These are three points of agreement among all men.

Statements of like character abound in Parker's theological writings. It would be safe to defy the reader to point out any thing of a contradictory nature in that author's works.

The simple fact is, that Buddhism gives the most direct and positive refutation to Parker's religious scheme in each of its fundamental principles. The question came up indirectly in the latter part of the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century, whether Buddhism was atheistic. Some had called China an empire of atheists; others declared that an atheistic State was a sheer impossibility. Bayle had argued the contrary, and of course had drawn much attention to the subject. Voltaire had taken the other side in an article on atheism in the "Philosophical Dictionary." Voltaire said: "Those nations neither affirm nor deny God; they have never heard him mentioned. To claim that they are atheists is the same imputation as if we should say that they are anti-Cartesians: they are neither for nor against Descartes. They are true children; a child is neither an atheist nor a deist, he is nothing." Whether Bayle or Voltaire had the better of it, Parker has the worse. Both Bayle and Voltaire deny his right to say that at the time of Christ all men were agreed in believing in the existence of God.

Since the beginning of our century a great flood of light has been brought to bear on this subject. Prinsep, Turnour, Lassen, Weber, Bournouf, Gogerly, and Saint-Hilaire unite in this confession of the atheistic character of Buddhism. Nobody who has studied the original documents of that religion

ventures to dispute this result. Whoever has read the interesting pages of its most faithful interpreters is driven helplessly to this opinion. Mr. Abbot, of "The Index," denies the fact, but admits that all the evidence is against him, and he confesses that his denial proceeds from a theological prejudice against the possibility of such a fact. Clarke, in his "Ten Great Religions," also concedes this statement of the case, but strives to diminish its importance. Alger confesses the true state of the case, but couples his confession with the strange assertion that their atheism has done as much for its votaries as Christian theism has achieved for its adherents!

Let the reader consider deeply the grave and judicial language of Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire:

> There is not the least trace of a belief in God in all Buddhism, and to suppose that it allows the absorption of the human soul in the divine or infinite soul is a purely gratuitous hypothesis, which is not even possible under the system of Buddha. In order to believe that man may be lost in God, with whom he is reunited, would it not be needful to begin with believing in God himself? We can hardly say that Buddha does not believe in him. He is so completely ignorant of God that he does not try to deny him; he does not suppress him, but he does not speak of him either to explain the origin or the anterior existences of man, either to explain his present life or to conjecture his future life, nor his ultimate deliverance. Buddha knows God in no way whatever; and, given up wholly to his heroic sorrows and sympathies, he never carried his glance so far nor so high.

Elsewhere he says, in passing, "There is no trace of the idea of God in all Buddhism from beginning to end;" and again, "as Buddhism admits the idea of God in no way whatever."

It is true that Saint-Hilaire, whose work was only published the year before Parker died, has been led by circumstances to insist more on the atheistic side of Buddhism than others had done. Lest any should infer that injustice is done Parker by quoting an author who was not accessible to him against his opinions, I shall cite Bournouf on the same point. So little research had Parker made, that he does not even appear to have looked into Bournouf's chapter on the Metaphysics of Buddhism, in the Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism. Had he taken this trifling pains, he could not have read a dozen pages without coming upon this passage:

The Svâbhâvikas, whom Mr. Hodgson regards as the most ancient philosophical school known at Nepal, deny the existence of a spiritual principle. They only recognize Nature taken absolutely, to which they ascribe energies, in the number of which is included not only activity but also intelligence. Nature is eternal as well as its energies, and it has two modes, that of Pravrĭtti or existence, and that of Nirvrĭtti or cessation, repose. The energies of Nature are under their proper form in the state of Nirvrĭtti; they take an animated and material form in the state of Pravrĭtti, a state which Nature enters spontaneously, and not by the will or action of any being different from herself. The creation and destruction of the universe are the effect of the eternal succession of these two states of Nature, and not that of the will of a Creator God who does not exist.

There is much more of a similar nature in the same chapter, whence we may judge how carefully Parker had looked into Buddhism.

Nor can any inference more favorable to Parker result from the fact that Bournouf describes an existing theistic school of Buddhists which holds to "an immaterial essence and a God;" this God they strip of providence, refuse him power over the world, and deny him ability to assist them in their woes, or influence their condition in Pravrĭtti. For Bournouf adds: "The idea of God . . . has not taken deep root. It seems to me evident that it was superposed upon a system anterior to itself and which knew nothing of it."

Of immortality Parker writes: "The idea of immortality, like the idea of God, in a certain sense is born in us, and, as fast as we come to a consciousness of ourselves, we come to consciousness of God, and of ourselves as immortal." Yet the most cursory view of Buddhism would have gone far toward overthrowing this conception of the origin of the doctrine. Parker does admit that there was one form of religion among civilized men in which it was not clearly taught, but wherein it was constantly implied. There is no doubt that in this language he has the Jews in mind, and makes himself the echo of an erroneous view of Old Testament doctrine once pretty widely entertained. Against this statement we cite the same witnesses and in the same order as before. Skepticism has been a constant phenomenon in humanity. In every circle of believers is found a Thomas who can trust only his own senses on a question of fact; in all groups of philosophical inquirers

there is a Simmias whom no argument will quite convince of doctrines he would fain receive. Since these doubters do not question the axioms of mathematics, nor deny that lead is heavy and sugar sweet, how do they come to dispute the fact of immortality, if this truth, like those, is given in intuition?

This skeptical element obtains no competent treatment in Parker's hands. He blames Christians mainly for its existence. Sometimes he seems to admit that such unbelievers really exist, at others he would fain think that their denial is no more than a reaction from the absurdities of the popular religion. Indeed, he admits the skepticism of individuals in words cited some time ago, but he holds that no nation ever doubted or disbelieved immortality.

There have been some differences of opinion among learned men who have studied Buddhism as to the fundamental notion of *Nirvaña*, that beatific state wherein men are delivered from the law of transmigration. The opinion that it marks extinction of personal existence has been shown, by Bournouf especially, to be the best grounded in philology, and most in keeping with the system of Buddhistic ideas, and with the great mission of Buddha as the reformer of Brahminism. This great authority constantly renders *Nirvaña* by complete annihilation, as may be seen, for example, in the deeply-interesting translation (page 74, *et seq.*, Intro.) of the Sûtra of Mândhâtrĭ, and also in a note or the appendix, where this rendering is elaborately justified. It should also be noted that the Buddhists draw no such distinction between the soul and the body as is constantly in our minds. They think and speak of man as a concrete living entity, as we think of a tree or a planet; and it is the extinction of this concrete being which the entire monastic discipline of Buddhism seeks to effect, and to which they give the name Nirvaña when effected. It is impossible to read the accounts of Buddha's personal discipline, his description of his final attainment of the condition of full illumination, and his entrance upon Nirvaña, and not be struck with this fact. Saint-Hilaire also points out that to suppose that Nirvaña indicates absorption into God is an absurdity in a system that knows nothing of God.

All that we have been able to gather up from a great variety of sources fully justifies Saint-Hilaire in summing up the re-

sults of his Buddhistic studies on the question of immortality in these pregnant terms:

> According to Buddha, the soul, or rather that compound of soul and body which is called man, is only delivered when annihilated; should the least atom remain the soul might still be born again under some of the numberless appearances which existence assumes, and its pretended deliverance would only be illusion like all the rest. The sole asylum, the sole reality, is nothingness, for from that there is no return; once reposing in Nirvaña, the soul has nothing more to fear, nothing more to hope; it no longer is. . . . I do not hesitate to affirm that such is the entire Buddhistic doctrine; people would be greatly perplexed to point out a single passage in the Nivarña which meant any thing else. The Nirvaña is never presented except as eternal deliverance, the infallible cessation of all sorrows and all fresh births by the annihilation of all the principles of which man is composed.

We think it needless to point out other direct inconsistencies between Parker's assertions on these topics and the results of Buddhism. But we may note that the third of the "three points" whereon Parker says "all nations of the earth were agreed at the time of Christ," must share the fate of the other two. This point is "the existence of a religious nature in man . . . that has communication with God." How can a religion which does not acknowledge the distinct existence of a human spirit teach any such communication with God, especially when it shows not a trace of the idea of God? What becomes of Parker's declaration, that "individuals may forget all these, but nations never?" And what becomes of Parker's alleged careful examination of Buddhism? It is well known that Mr. Parker deems the connection between faith in God and immortality and practical morals a very intimate one. He insists upon this with emphasis somewhat unusual. Indeed, Mr. Alger has censured this as a defect in his scheme of religious thought; the latter affirms that duty will still remain duty for man though there be neither God nor immortal life. In truth, there seems to be an effort making in some quarters to make morality independent of religious dogmas altogether. In this matter Parker was wiser than his friends. But Parker himself had apparently no notion how dim the sense of duty might grow where the great Taskmaster is forgotten and the sanction of life everlasting is unknown. In such a state of

things man becomes his own judge; the good or evil consequences of his conduct do not attend him beyond the grave, and therefore conscience must speak clearly and to unusually tender sensibilities to have much constraining force. The recognition of a moral law above us, which we are held to obey, could not be very clear in such circumstances. The supreme duty would then coincide with wisely-calculated interest. Contrary to his expectations, Parker might have found this statement illustrated in the case of Buddha himself. When he had gained decided views as to the means to be adopted in order to obtain deliverance from the woes of existence, he hesitated whether to communicate his views to others or not. The account of his hesitation is instructive. Buddha reflected much on the difficulty of securing attention to such abstract doctrines as his; he thrice resolved to resist the compassionate emotions which would lead him to proclaim his new system; finally the consideration that he might save those who were in involuntary error decided him. It is not a stern impulse of duty that controls him; he yields rather to a compassion which he held himself free to obey or resist. But duty is mandatory, and addresses not sympathy but conscience. Another illustration is found in the conduct of a disciple of Buddha. When young Oupagoupta resisted the seductions of a fair and rich prostitute, he did not say that continence is a duty, and that culpable desires must be resisted; he thinks it better for those who aspire to deliverance, and who would escape the law of successive births, not to go to see that woman. This is calculation, not duty; selfishness, not virtue. As to virtuous conduct in general, the proper notion of it would seem impossible under a system which enjoins the most remorseless asceticism in order to the attainment of the dreamless repose of Nirvaña. Since each was to undergo that discipline for himself, and none could lighten the task of another, social virtue could have but little scope. Accordingly the word duty itself seems restricted among them to the punctilious discharge of the dreary exactions of the ascetic life. How should such a fact come to pass, unless duty takes its form and complexion very much from the religious creed under which it springs into life?

Such were some of the difficulties which this form of religion opposes to Parker's account of the origin of his three great

theological doctrines. They show that his scheme is untenable: unless their force may in some way be broken they stab his system to the heart. Parker does not seek to explain these facts; he knows nothing of their existence. The references which he makes to Buddhism in the "Experience as a Minister" show that down to his last illness he had not the least suspicion of the true state of the case. These are painful discoveries. I cannot help the conviction that they compel us to think either that Parker willfully misrepresented the doctrinal contents of the religion of one of the great non-Christian sects, or that he knowingly attempted to impose upon men a thoroughly false notion of his acquaintance with the historical forms of religion. Had it been some insignificant sect of religionists that was under discussion some allowance might be possible. But Buddhism! It is centuries older than Christianity. It has had a larger proportion of the human race under its sway than any other form of faith. Its scheme of doctrine is singularly strange and impressive. Its founder, with the single exception of Jesus of Nazareth, is the most original and touching figure among the great founders of religions. It has as many adherents to-day as Christianity, if not more. On all these grounds it is an object of singular interest; and for a man of Parker's reputation, lauded honesty, boasted learning, and alleged thoroughness of research, to be so utterly out of his reckoning in a subject he professed to have studied, puts it out of our power to trust him anywhere. Perhaps nobody who will read this paper will feel the shock of such disclosures more deeply than the writer has done. When one finds his confidence abused by men who vaunt their sincerity, a reaction comes on like that which soldiers feel on finding that the foe has poisoned the wells. These are discoveries which are fatal to reputation and simple good faith.

Why go on? exclaims some impatient reader. Why continue a critique which is already completed? Patience! good reader, patience! and I will presently bring the matter where it may safely rest.

Other points in Parker's theology demand some attention. Since Parker pretends that the three great dogmas of religion on which he mainly insists are beyond the need of formal logical proof, as being the results of intuition, it is a matter of some

interest to know whether he paid the same respect to all truths given in intuition. Certainly he was bound in all candor to do so. Since the nature of intuitive ideas was first well unfolded, the belief in the freedom of man as a moral agent has gained a much more powerful hold on philosophers than it previously had. This proceeds from the fact that the notes of self-evidence, necessity, and catholicity all appear inseparably connected with our knowledge that we are the self-conscious performers of any intended act. Before and since this fact was brought out men have been necessitarians. Men have argued that the world had no being, or that they were not in existence. They will, no doubt, go on doing so as long as they think themselves bound in consistency to such views. Haven, Hamilton, M'Cosh, and others may be warped by theological bias into statements which directly contradict their philosophical conviction of the real moral liberty of mankind. But when men argue against truth given intuitively we are warned of it by the fact that neither they, nor we, nor any body can be content with the argument. Human nature is too strong for our delusions, and forces us to belie our logic. None who know the facts will deny that the necessitarians, as well as others, have acted in general as if they believed in free will. Men who argue that sugar is sour and peaches poisonous are sure to be illogical at dessert. The stories of Zeno scourging his slave for theft under plea that the same fate decreed the stinging of the slave's back which ordained his crime, and of an ass starving between two bundles of hay so precisely at the same distance from him as to render the motives to snatch at the one a perfect counterpoise to those which turned him toward the other—a hit as old, at least, as Dante—show that men always felt the practical absurdity of the scheme of necessity. One would suppose that Parker would have been a stout defender of freedom, not only because it has the sanction of intuition, but also because it seems a direct postulate of one of his favorite theological maxims, namely, the adequacy of human nature for its functions. But, nevertheless, Parker was a necessitarian. He tells us that in creation God's "motive *must* be love," the purpose "to secure the highest good of each and all . . . and every thing *must* be perfectly adapted to secure its purpose." Since he lays such a heavy

hand of necessity on God it is easy to think how man will fare in his hands. He fears to allow men a real freedom lest they should abuse it in perpetual rebellion against the heavenly Father. He grants man all the outward shows of freedom; he even says that God will find ways to bring every sinner back to holiness without violence to his free agency, just as some Calvinists tell us God will infallibly cause the wicked to perform his predestinated sin without prejudice to his liberty. We have already seen that he early declared ninety-nine one hundredths of all sins might be accounted for by the circumstances of the sinners, and that very little sin really affected the soul. He paints liberty as involved in only a small part of human conduct, and where freedom issues in transgression, he says its evil consequences are so controlled by external forces that no real and permanent mischief can result. "However, unlike attraction, justice does not work free from all hinderance; it develops itself through conscious agents that continually change, and pass by experiment from low to higher degrees of life and development, to higher forms of justice. There is a certain force, personal and peculiar to each one of us, controlled by individual will; this may act in the line with the great normal force of justice, or it may conflict for a time with the general law of the universe, having private mutations, oscillations, and aberrations, personal or national. But these minor forces are sure to be overcome after awhile by the great general moral force."

It was such views as these which led Parker to talk of the vilest criminals as sure, at last, of a prodigal's welcome to a father's house. Sin ceases to be sin under such a scheme. Human resistance to it must grow feebler in exact proportion as these ideas win acceptance. But what is most striking is the utter conflict between such views and any tenable theory of human freedom. Yet the conviction of freedom is the outcome of those very powers of intuition which Parker makes the foundation of all certainty in theology. Strange that he should claim the authority of intuitive truth for the existence of God and immortality, which have no mark of intuition, and deny that authority to our self-attested conscious moral liberty. Such are the confusion and contradiction which pervade this theological scheme.

The subject of Providence is handled in this lofty tone:

> From the infinite perfection of God it follows that his providence is perfect, that is, completely perfect and perfectly complete. . . . The universe, that is, the sum total of created matter and of created mind, must be perfectly fitted to produce the purpose which God designs; that must be a benevolent purpose, involving the greatest possible bliss for each and for all.

To this end Parker thinks all things are sternly controlled and directed. To fail in this, he argues, would imply some weakness or defect in God—defective wisdom, justice, love, power, or holiness. We should naturally suppose from this statement that the universe as it exists is the best possible; that every thing is as every thing should be, and that what men call evil is only disguised good. The hardihood of such assertions does not deter Mr. Parker. He devotes a long sermon to the discussion of divine Providence. We cite another passage, much like the last, but modified in some important points:

> He, inasmuch as he is God, must exercise an infinite providence over each and all his works. The universe, that is, the sum total of created matter and created mind, must be perfectly fitted to achieve the purpose God designs; that must be a benevolent purpose, involving the greatest possible bliss for each and all, for the infinite God could desire no other end. From this it follows that the material part of the universe, and its immaterial part also, must be perfectly adapted to that end. All this follows from the idea of God as infinitely perfect.

Parker's tone in these passages approaches blasphemy. He talks about what God *must do* and *cannot do*, as though there were no thought of the divine mind or purpose of the divine will but it were known to him altogether. Apart from the spirit of the passage, consider the difficulties it must needs encounter. Two that instantly and urgently press themselves upon our minds are physical evil and moral evil. To the consideration of each of these difficulties Parker sets apart a long discourse. The Christian treatment of this subject is well-known. That holds pain and misery, moral error and guilt, as the direct and indirect consequences of deliberate human transgression. They are presented as partly corrective and partly retributive. The thinker who asserts that the physical and moral world are parts of a perfect whole has a very dif-

ferent thesis to maintain. Draw your picture of the physical woes of mankind in the very darkest hues that truth will warrant. Count up the diseases which prey upon health and life. How vast and fearful the array! Number up the political evils that oppress the groaning earth: war, slavery, poverty, each with its dismal train of woes. Paint the social evils that prey on the human race: class-jealousies, intemperance, and prostitution. How endless and various the mischiefs which they inflict on mortals! Look at the intellectual errors of humanity: false ideas in politics, like the divine right of kings to rule the earth, or the duty of the temporal sovereign to enforce obedience to the State religion with the sword, or the right to enslave captives, from which nearly all systems of serfdom have arisen. Look at the false religions, with their awful trains of attendant curses; at true religion, with the corruptions into which it has fallen, and the errors with which it has been mixed up. The Christian doctrine is that these evils all flow from human sinfulness and error; that had man been ever obedient to God he would never have known such burdens, and that if he returns to obedience he will ultimately escape from these unspeakable sorrows. But Mr. Parker was compelled by his theological position to reckon all such things blessings. His logic was very briefly and sharply put. He said, "God is infinite goodness and infinite power. Infinite goodness must desire only a perfectly good creation, and infinite power must be able to produce the perfect world desired by infinite goodness." When a thinker goes so far as this, he ought to draw his conclusion in fair and plain terms. That conclusion must be that, since God has created this world, it must be a perfect world. To state such a result coolly would be its refutation to all unbiased and thoughtful minds. But Parker does not meet the question frankly; he feels that the inquiry whether pain and sin can have existence in a perfect world is sure to confront him. Hence he divides the question, and, overlooking sin as far as possible, supposes one to ask, "Is it possible that there shall be pain in the animal world, which the infinite God has created from perfect motives, of perfect material, for a perfect purpose, and as a perfect means thereto?" Parker answers, "Yes. I cannot clear up all difficulties. . . . I shall be obliged to refer to the idea of God as

infinite, and from that deduce the value of the function of the special forms of sin and misery. . . . When I know that there is an infinite God I am sure that his purpose is good and his means adequate. I spontaneously trust therein. This instinctive trust outruns the reflective demonstrations of science." Really, Mr. Parker has nothing further to say on this matter. His entire belief may be summed up in a few words: "I believe that pain, sin, misery, and death, may all exist in a perfect world." There he should have left the matter. But there he was not content to leave it, and from this point forth all that he writes is pure sophistry. Parker proceeds to say, "It is both pleasant and instructive to learn the use and function of things by themselves, by an inductive study of the facts, and not be obliged to deduce the conclusion merely from the idea of God." Indeed, it would be, Mr. Parker.

To help him through his perilous task, a distinction is drawn between absolute and partial evil: absolute evil is uncompensated evil; partial evil is compensated evil. Parker's aim is to show that most of the evil known to us has its compensations; and where he cannot do this he resorts to the infinite goodness to supplement all logical deficiencies. Poisonous plants have a disgusting odor and are unpleasant to the eye. The lobelia which would sicken the animals that might eat it reads nature's riot-act to them all in its evil scent. Such pain is benevolent. The rabbit tears his skin in the brambles, and would wear his life away but for the benevolent pain which warns him. The dog would soon wear off his feet on the sharp stones, but pain ensuing makes him careful, and he goes four-legged all his days. Lobsters and crabs lose their legs quite often, but it is of no consequence, since new ones will grow; but their sensitiveness to heat and cold keeps them in just those positions where it is best for them to live. This sensitiveness in dogs and lobsters is benevolent. So is the uneasiness of birds of passage as the time of migration draws nigh. The fear which wings the flight of the hare is a protection to his weakness. The pain of animals on the loss of their young has a like beneficent design. Under its impulse the timid partridge and the cowardly hen grow very courageous in defense of their offspring. When its work is accomplished the benevolent pain ceases.

All this is perfectly irrelevant. The question is not whether certain compensations attend most of the pain, sorrow, misery, and sins with which the world swarms, and whether we may not reasonably conjecture that, with a complete acquaintance with all the facts involved, we should find this hold true of all misery and sin. Could this be demonstrated in every particular, it would merely show that there is a providential care that soothes our woes, not that the woes are unreal. I can hardly think that Parker could have been unconscious of the sophistry of his procedure. When a man lies at the last gasp it may be a comfort that tender hands perform the last offices of friendship about his bed, but the presence of death is not the less significant or appalling. The plain issue is this: "Is our world perfect, or a perfect part of a perfect whole?" Parker replies dubiously: "The Creator is infinitely powerful and infinitely good. Infinite goodness could have acted only on the impulse of love in the act of creation, only with the intent of securing the highest welfare of each and all; and infinite power must have been able to execute these plans of the supreme benevolence, and so. . ." Here Mr. Parker hesitates. Logically he ought to declare the actual world he had been trying so hard to reform a perfect world, and he knew it too well to affirm that. "I cannot explain every thing," he says deprecatingly, as if he could explain nearly every thing, and were only protesting against too severe handling for failure in a trifle or two. "There are compensations to much of our pain," he mildly suggests. But the compensation is fugitive, incomplete, and immensely out of proportion to the evil. It has not the least tendency to prove that the world is perfect; at best it is a mere hint, a wavering suggestion, of an intervening Providence. Then, too, there are evils for which even Mr. Parker can detect no compensation. But he insinuates that this doubtless proceeds from the narrowness of our range of vision. And the conclusion is hinted that, if we could only obtain this larger view of compensation, every thing would stand forth free from all difficulty. In all this Mr. Parker is even painfully and pitifully off the track. The question, we repeat, is not whether there be more or less compensation for ills undergone here, but how there comes to be such measureless mischiefs and wickedness to compensate. Confronted with this question, Parker

confesses the existence and magnitude of existing evils, and refers us to his notion of an infinitely perfect God as the only solution. Yet this is a solution which does not solve the difficulty; not only does not solve it, but the argument is left in such a position that a Pessimist might easily retort it on the stump-orator of Music Hall. He might say, "I entirely agree with you; there has been no supernatural revelation, and I think there will be none. We must gather our notions of God painfully, as we can, from such evidence as we may attain. You deduce from your philosophy the notion of a perfect God, who must have created the world perfect. I do not see that your idea of him is really based on intuition, and I know by intuition the existence of unspeakable evils in the existing world. From these evils, attested by intuition, I infer that the Supreme either is weak, and cannot hinder evil, or careless, and suffers it through negligence, or angry and malignant, so as to delight in it, or just, and therefore inflicts it on the disobedient." The Pessimist would be far more logical than Parker. So we reach the result that the skeptic of Music Hall was totally unable to set up any coherent or tenable scheme of religion in place of that he sought to destroy. We find him claiming the sanction of intuition for great religious truths which the intuitions do not warrant, speaking of facts of consciousness as if they all had intuitional value, pretending an analysis of the religious history of our race which he never really made, denying intuitive convictions which would put his religious system in peril, and deducing from an arbitrary conception of God the perfection of the creation, while admitting the awful presence of evil in the material and spiritual realm. We pronounce his speculations crude, incoherent, and contradictory. They make measureless demands upon our faith at the very moment that we see them to be untenable in philosophy. We take leave of his theology, sure that it can never exert any great control over those who are careful students of its fundamental principles.

Art. III.—THE TEMPERANCE REFORM.

The use of intoxicants for the sake of the pleasurable effect, the methods whereby the brain and the whole nervous system may be drugged into artificial repose, and the mind exalted into an artificial sense of happiness, seem to have been known from the earliest ages. In the twenty-fourth century before Christ Noah "planted a vineyard, and he drank of the wine, and was drunken." Homer, who lived eight or nine hundred years before Christ, often speaks of wine, and also describes Helen, the wife of Menelaus, as preparing for her guests a *nepenthe*, a mystic beverage, the effects of which, as set forth by the poet, are recognized as simply intoxication.

Doubtless, even in those early times, various kinds of intoxicants were employed. The East addicted itself chiefly to opium and hemp, while the Western nations had recourse mostly to alcoholic beverages. For many centuries none but those which are now classified as fermented drinks were known. Intoxicating wine or beer was obtained from the juice of the grape, the apple, the pear, from honey and milk, and from preparations of wheat, barley, and the various cereals. These beverages were sometimes made still more intoxicating by the addition of powerful drugs of various kinds.

In their simplest forms, however, these alcoholic drinks were regarded as liable to be used to the injury of the consumer. The Hebrew Scriptures abound in warnings. The Chinese historians claim that one of their emperors, eleven centuries before the Christian era, prohibited the use of wine because of the innumerable evils which it produces. The Carthagenians by law forbade the use of wine in the camps of their armies, and also commanded every magistrate to abstain totally during the term of his public service. Draco punished drunkenness with death. Lycurgus, King of Thrace, alarmed by the effects of wine among his subjects, commanded all the vines in his kingdom to be destroyed; and centuries later Terbaldus, a Bulgarian prince, enforced the same stern but effectual measure among his people.

The invention of the process of distillation increased the

evil. The intoxicant, in its concentrated form, can be more easily conveyed from place to place, and when used the effect is more rapid and powerful. When or by whom the distilling process was discovered cannot now be ascertained. The first distinct historic reference to it dates back to the thirteenth century, when we hear of it in connection with the researches of the Alchemists. Distillation has supplied new facilities for indulgence, and augmented the ravages of intemperance in all lands. Distilled spirits were at first kept by the apothecary, and used only as a medicine. They are mentioned as having been used as a cordial for the first time in 1581 by the English soldiers who were engaged in assisting the Netherlands in the war with Spain.

The manifold evils attending the common use of intoxicants darken the page from the very beginning of history. A nation not yet escaped from the hard toil and frugal fare inseparable from the first subduing of the soil, might indeed be for a time protected by its poverty; but no sooner had agriculture and the other arts begun their progress, and a degree of civilization been attained, than this insidious foe began to undermine their rising greatness. Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, Rome, all the great nations of the past, felt its power. Here and there a wise king saw the peril; statesmen sometimes exerted their wisdom and ingenuity to avert the evil, or at least retard its steady advance; but their success was too often only partial, or, at the best, temporary. To-day intoxicants hold sway in all lands, in defiance of reason, conscience, the instinct of self-preservation, and of the united power of civilization and Christianity.

The Temperance Reform in its present shape, putting forth a definite doctrine, seeking strength in organization, and joining open battle with the enemy, is of very recent date. There was indeed in England, four hundred years ago, an association formed, the members of which pledged themselves not to exceed a certain quantity of alcoholic drink per diem; but such reform measures as this were at that time of necessity only the fancy or the freak of a day, an agreement of boon companions, made with little of conviction, and speedily broken. On Christmas day, in the year 1600, a company of German nobles formed a society which they named "The Order of Tem-

perance," the members of which pledged themselves never to become intoxicated, and, to this end, never to exceed fourteen cups of wine a day.

Almost down to our own times the sincere advocates of reform were rendered well-nigh powerless by the lack of a true theory. It seemed to be generally conceded that the moderate use of alcoholic beverages is beneficial, and that excess only is deleterious. Even as late as 1820 there were societies organized in New Jersey, the members of which bound themselves by solemn pledge not to exceed half a pint each in their daily consumption of rum and whisky. Still this measure, ridiculous as it now looks, may be construed as evidence that the popular mind was beginning to wake to a sense of the evils which darkened the land. The fearful havoc of intemperance had forced itself upon public attention, and men were beginning to study the problems thrust upon them. In the year 1800 Micajah Pendleton, of Nelson County, Virginia, drew up a pledge which prohibited the use, not only of distilled spirits, but of wine and cider. Having signed it himself, he circulated it among his neighbors for signatures, but made no attempt to organize a society or originate any general movement.

A noted patriot of the Revolution has the honor of leading the vanguard of the Temperance Reform. In 1804 Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia, an eminent physician and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, published an essay entitled "An Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits upon the Human Body and Mind." It is not unjust to other good men to say that this was the first effectual blow struck in the war of argument and scientific research. In 1805, Dr. Ebenezer Porter, of Connecticut, preached and published an able sermon on the subject of intemperance, discussing the matter from the religious point of view. These publications, coming as they did from sources which insured them a hearing, accomplished much good. Dr. Rush's essay, in particular, attracted great attention, not only throughout the United States, but in Europe.

In 1808 a society was formed in Saratoga County, New York, as the result of the active labors of Dr. B. J. Clark, of Moreau. It assumed the name of "The Temperate Society of

Moreau and Northumberland." Forty-three members, chiefly farmers, agreed not to drink "rum, gin, whisky, wine, or any distilled spirits, or compositions of the same, or any of them, except by the advice of a physician, or in case of actual disease, (also excepting wine at public dinners,) under penalty of twenty-five cents." The fine for getting drunk was fifty cents. The next year, 1809, the "Greenfield and Milton Temperance Society" was organized, with a form of pledge which went nearly, if not quite, to the extent of excluding all beverages which contained in any degree the intoxicating element; but the movement was so far in advance of public sentiment that it attracted little attention.

In 1811 the General Association of Massachusetts appointed a committee to co-operate with committees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and the General Association of Connecticut in devising measures to lessen the mischiefs produced by the excessive use of intoxicating liquors. After several meetings and considerable correspondence, the committee determined in favor of the establishment of a State society for the prosecution of the work of reform. A general meeting of all friendly to the project was called at the State House in Boston, and on the 5th of February, 1813, the Constitution of "The Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance" was adopted and the Society was formed. The object of the Society, as defined in the second article, was "to discountenance and suppress the too free use of ardent spirits, and its kindred vices, profaneness and gaming, and to encourage and promote temperance and general morality." This Society effected some local good, but the timid, compromising language in which it defined its object evinces unsettled convictions and uncertain counsels. It was, however, a beginning. It helped to keep the eyes of thinking men directed to the evils around them, and to the question of efficient remedy. They began to see more and more clearly that to argue and strive against excess only is labor lost, and that the theory which allowed the "moderate" use must be abandoned, or nothing awaited the Society but a feeble existence and final defeat. It was resolved, therefore, to form a society on a better foundation.

In the autumn of 1825 a few earnest advocates of reform met to compare views, and after prayer, and a free and full

conference, resolved to attempt the formation of a society based on the principle of abstinence from the use of all distilled liquors. Invitations were issued, and after prolonged consultation, and one or two preliminary meetings, the society was formed, the Constitution being adopted and the officers elected at a meeting held in Boston, February 13, 1826. Thus "The American Society for the Promotion of Temperance" sprang into life, and began its career of power and usefulness, the Rev. Mr. Hewitt being appointed the first General Agent, and laboring for six months with great efficiency. In 1827, the Rev. Justin Edwards, D.D., was elected Corresponding Secretary, which office he filled with great ability and success till 1836.

The cause had now really taken hold upon the public mind. Societies were forming in every direction. In 1829 there were eleven State organizations, and about a thousand local societies. It is evident that the correct theory of reform had not yet been reached; but the measures which had been inaugurated secured a candid and thorough investigation and a fearless interpretation of the facts; and the public mind, once roused to vigorous action, would not be likely to rest in any position which compromised the truth. Yet the principle upon which the Society sought to carry on the war against intemperance was incorrect, and, as an instrument of reform, was wholly inadequate to do the work. To condemn distilled liquors, and at the same time allow the use of fermented beverages, is to make a broad distinction where there is little real difference.

Fermented liquors are simply dilutions of alcohol. Distilled spirits are merely a concentration of the same intoxicant. The difference between the two is not one of nature but of form—a matter of bulk and weight only. If distilled spirits are more dangerous than the other forms of the intoxicant, it is because by the diminution of bulk and weight they become more available for continual and reckless indulgence. The stomach and the veins, mathematically considered, will contain as much of the concentration as of the dilution, and consequently, by using the concentration, the drinker is able to subject himself to the action of a larger dose of the drug. A man may drink at one draught brandy sufficient to kill him in a few hours. If he cannot do the same thing by the use of beer or cider it is

merely because the quantity which he finds himself able to swallow does not contain enough of the drug to be fatal. Moreover, the concentrated forms of the drug afford greater facilities for concealment, conveyance, and perpetual indulgence. In journeying by land or sea, on foot, on horseback, or in the train, men carry brandy where they would not dream of carrying a supply of beer. A given amount of alcohol concentrated will also intoxicate more rapidly than if largely diluted. Distilled spirits, too, can be kept for any length of time without change, whereas fermented liquors are liable to become acid and unpalatable.

And yet the intoxicating principle of wine, beer, cider, whisky, rum, brandy, and all the rest, is one and the same. It is the alcohol which gives to each its fascination, and produces the coveted effect. It is the alcohol which by continued use slowly and silently binds soul and body in chains, and drags its hapless victim through all depths of shame and sorrow down to a drunkard's grave and a drunkard's hell. When the friends of reform sounded the alarm against distilled spirits, but were silent in regard to the use of fermented beverages, they committed an enormous mistake—a mistake which would have necessarily proved fatal to their hopes had it not been so palpable an error that it could not last.

But imperfect as were the tools with which it wrought, the Society did good work, and the reform progressed. Some of the ablest men of the day identified themselves with it, and warmly advocated its principles. The same year in which the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance was formed, the Rev. Lyman Beecher, then pastor of a Church in Litchfield, Conn., preached to his people six powerful discourses on the "Nature, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance." These sermons were published in 1827, and produced a great effect. Dr. Reuben D. Mussey, Professor of Anatomy and Surgery in Dartmouth College, delivered an elaborate and thoroughly scientific address before the Medical Convention of New Hampshire, in which he gave all the weight of his professional reputation to the cause of reform. President Wilbur Fisk, of the Wesleyan University, at Middletown, Conn., was among its most eloquent advocates. Chancellor Walworth, of New York, was one of the first presidents of the general Society. Stephen Van

Rensselaer and Edward C. Delavan, both of Albany, N. Y., were foremost in contributing funds for spreading information by means of the press. Samuel Chipman visited the almshouses and prisons throughout the State of New York, and the appalling array of facts which he presented in his reports was quoted at every public meeting. He found by careful inquiry that "three fourths of the pauperism, and more than five sixths of the crime," sprang directly from the drinking habits of the people. These able sermons, essays, and reports had a wide circulation, and everywhere attracted attention and produced conviction. In every part of the land temperance societies were organized, and multitudes signed the pledge and thus publicly enrolled themselves in the ranks of reform.

The arguments adduced and the facts gathered by the advocates of temperance made their way abroad, and attracted the attention of thoughtful men of other nations. In 1829 the first temperance society in the British dominions, pledging its members to abstain from all use of distilled liquors, was formed at New Ross, Ireland, as the result of the labors of the Rev. George Carre. The same year a society of the same character was formed in Glasgow, Scotland. The first society in England was organized in Yorkshire in the early part of 1830, and the first public meeting of the London Temperance Society was held in June of that year. A temperance society was also formed in Sweden in 1830. In 1831 the Hibernia Temperance Society was organized in Dublin. In a very short space of time temperance societies were established in Canada, in various European countries, and in Bermuda, South Africa, Australia, India, and Ceylon. In the Sandwich Islands the Queen ordered all the ardent spirits on hand to be destroyed, and forbade the importation. Thus the minds of men were drawn to the consideration of the evils of intemperance, and earnest search was made for an effectual remedy. In America great results were produced. The well-authenticated statistics of Mr. Chipman and others created alarm, and forced upon all candid minds the conviction that the most strenuous efforts ought to be put forth to stay the ravages of the destroyer; and, unquestionably, great good was accomplished. In 1833 there were already six thousand local societies, with more than a million of members; two thousand distilleries had been stopped;

five thousand inebriates had been saved, and the spirit ration had been wholly discontinued in the United States army, and nearly so in the navy.

And still the logic of the reform was incomplete, the solid rock had not yet been reached. The great efforts of the reformers had been directed against the use of distilled liquors only, and the pledge in general use had reference to these alone. It was tacitly conceded, or even openly confessed, that cider, beer, and wine are harmless, and perhaps indispensable. The model temperance man was represented as one who abhors the "fiery product of the still," and indulges only in the "pure blood of the grape" or of the apple. Nevertheless, great good had been done. A fearless spirit of inquiry had been aroused; public attention had been called to the existence of an enormous evil; the consciences of Christians had been reached, and the public mind, once in motion, would not rest until it had pushed its researches and its reasonings to their true termination. A pyramid cannot be made to stand on its little end. The Temperance Reform could not maintain the position in which it was placed.

Brandy, rum, whisky, and the other liquors regarded as dangerous and prohibited by the pledge, contain about fifty per cent. of alcohol. Wine, beer, cider, the use of which was allowed, contain from eight to twenty per cent. of this self-same alcohol. The lover of brandy or whisky seldom or never drinks his favorite liquor without so diluting it with water as to make the mixture no stronger in alcohol than ordinary wine or cider. Why then condemn, in vigorous terms, the potations of the one class of victims, and commend the indulgences of the other? The chief difference between the wine-bibber and the brandy-drinker is, that the one finds his beverage already diluted, the other dilutes to suit his taste.

The logic of visible results was also against the half-way reasonings and partial measures of the Society. Not a few inebriates professed a desire to reform, and signed the pledge which bound them to abstain from distilled liquors; but while they continued the use of cider and wine the old appetite not only remained alive, but kept upon them, as firmly as ever, its iron grasp. It was soon seen that a drunkard could sign the pledge and keep it, and be intoxicated as often and as thoroughly

as ever. It was found, too, that the tyrannous appetite can be acquired by the use of fermented drinks, and that it is so acquired in a majority of cases where the ensnarement is fatal. The friends of the cause found their convictions tending, with the certainty of the law of gravitation, in the direction of the only true principle of reform—total abstinence from all that intoxicates.

As we have seen, this principle was incorporated in Micajah Pendleton's pledge in 1800, and also in the pledge of the Greenfield and Milton Society in 1809, but in neither case was any save a local effect produced. Nevertheless, thinking men began every-where to see that the reform must perfect its methods, and advance with the growing light. At a meeting of the Temperance Society of Preston, in the county of Lancaster, England, held March 26, 1833, a total abstinence pledge was adopted, and thirty-four persons signed it. By the close of the year there were six hundred members. At one of the meetings of this Society Richard Turner, a reformed inebriate, who had a slight impediment in his speech, made a little address, and, in naming the distinctive feature of the new movement, called it the *t-total* principle. The odd expression caught the public ear, and suited the public humor, and thus gave rise to the popular name of the Tee-total movement. During the year the example of the Preston reformers was followed by the societies at Paisley, Scotland, and St. John's, New Brunswick. In May, 1833, a Convention, to which all the temperance societies in the United States were invited to send delegates, was held at Philadelphia, for the purpose of forming a National Temperance Society. Four hundred delegates, representing twenty-one States, were in attendance, and the national organization was formed. A resolution was offered in favor of adopting the new form of the pledge, but was voted down. A similar resolution, offered at a meeting of the British and Foreign Temperance Society, met with the same fate. The Convention at Philadelphia, however, while refusing to adopt the new pledge, passed a resolution "that the vital interests and complete success of the temperance cause demand that in all the efforts of the friends of that cause against the use of ardent spirits, no substitute except pure water be *recommended* as a drink."

The agitation of the question of Total Abstinence, and the necessity of basing the whole reform movement upon it continued, and the most sincere and earnest friends of the cause were divided in opinion. Some thought the use of fermented beverages beneficial; some were fearful of ultra measures; some considered the new pledge a virtual condemnation of Christ and the miracle at Cana of Galilee. The controversy took a wide range; able articles appeared in the Reviews and other periodicals, and volumes not a few were published on the subject. But all the while experience and daily observation were steadily accumulating proofs that the old pledge was incomplete as a principle, and inadequate as a practical instrument of reform. A few of the original advocates of the cause could not be convinced of the wisdom of the advanced step proposed. Perhaps some of them, at the begining of the discussion, took ground with so much positiveness that they were hardly capable afterward of changing their opinions.

Still among the great mass of the active friends of the reform the advanced idea steadily gained strength, and at the annual meeting of the American Temperance Society, held at Saratoga in August, 1836, the total abstinence principle was formally adopted, and from that time it has been the settled policy of the whole reform movement in America. The English societies adopted the new pledge about the same time; and now, so far as we can learn, there is no society in existence which expects, on any other principle, to wage effectual war against intemperance.

Still the controversy is not yet wholly ended. While the active advocates of the reform long ago reached the conclusion that it is folly to war against distilled spirits, and at the same time tolerate the use of fermented drinks, there are a few others who claim to be "as much in favor of temperance as any body," and yet are constantly pleading for a return to the old platform. The brewers themselves are arguing that the true way to save the community from the evils of intemperance is to substitute beer for the more concentrated liquors. In their appeal to the Legislature of New Jersey, presented to that body in 1872, they attempt to show that the consumption of distilled spirits is decreasing, and claim that "this creditable diminution of consumption is not due to temperance

efforts," but that "the marked increase of malt liquors" proves that they "have evidently taken the place of the more potent spirits."

This sophism has often been urged in the discussion, and as often refuted. Distillation dates back six hundred years; drunkenness has been known among men for forty centuries. The Hebrew Scriptures often allude to the intemperance of the times. It was potent among the vices which overthrew Babylon, Persia, Macedon, and Rome. Camillus gained his great victory over Brennus and the Gauls because the enemy, exulting in their first success, began to plunder, and, finding abundance of wine, gave themselves up to beastly intoxication. Tacitus states that the Germans in his day were a drunken people, and that they made their intoxicating drink from barley. The Anglo-Saxons were fearfully addicted to drink, and so were the Danes who overran England a thousand years ago. All this was before the invention of the process of distillation. No depths of drunken debauch are deeper than those into which men plunged centuries before "the more potent spirits" were known. Consequently, by the use of fermented drinks only, there may be drunken revels as brutish as Belshazzar's feast, and as wide-spread intemperance and ruin as marked the last days of the Roman empire.

Modern examples are as significant as the ancient. The English cannot claim to be a temperate people. The London *Times*, a journal which has been noted during the whole period of its existence for a blind and venomous hatred of every thing in the shape of a reform, exclaims in a recent issue, "Among all the writers, all the talkers, all the preachers, all the workers, all the names we see daily blazoned on the rôle of English fame, are there none that will set about to abate this nuisance and scandal, our national drunkenness?" Yet beer is the bane of England, as truly as whisky is of Ireland. And the present enormous consumption of beer in England is in part, at least, the result of trusting in the fallacious idea that bad habits save men from worse. In the year 1830 certain British statesmen, deploring the prevalence of intemperance, thought to lessen the evil by increasing the facilities for the consumption of fermented beverages. This led to the passage of the famous "Beer-House Act" of the Duke of Wellington. One of the

effects which had been anticipated did really follow. The sale and use of beer rapidly increased until it assumed enormous proportions. The other effect which had been hoped for, the decrease in the consumption of distilled liquors, did not follow.

All classes of disinterested witnesses testify that the beer-houses of England are the source of incalculable evil. Nothing can be more conclusive than the report of the committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, published in 1869. The committee consisted of eighteen clergymen, all men of note in the Established Church. They sent circulars to reliable men, residents in various parts of the Archiepiscopate, which includes nearly half the population of England, asking for information in regard to the prevalent evil, and what ought to be done to suppress it. The replies elicited are almost unanimously to the effect that intemperance is increasing, and that the multiplication of beer-shops is the cause of it. The remedy recommended is, to close them. England has one million of her people dependent on public charity, and spends hundreds of millions of dollars annually for beer.

Our own country bids fair to repeat this melancholy experience. The manufacture of lager beer was introduced into the United States a little over twenty years ago, since which time the consumption of fermented beverages has increased at a rate which is well calculated to alarm as well as astonish us. During the early years of the manufacture the public had no reliable information in regard to the quantity made and consumed, but since the war the records of the Internal Revenue Department furnish full and reliable data. Breweries and distilleries are taxed in proportion to the quantities manufactured by them; and we can safely take it for granted that the manufacturers make and sell all upon which they pay the tax. The receipts of the department show as follows:

	Distilled Spirits. Gallons.		Fermented Drinks. Gallons.
1866	14,600,000	1866	158,569,000
1867	14,588,738	1867	180,399,000
1868	7,321,909	1868	176,265,000
1869	62,092,414	1869	181,858,000
1870	78,488,196	1870	188,527,000
1871	62,314,627	1871	221,951,000
1872	66,235,578	1872	248,309,000

These figures are taken directly from the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. They demonstrate the fact that the quantity of fermented drinks consumed among us has increased ninety millions of gallons in the space of six years, or at the rate of fifteen millions annually. Nearly the whole of the enormous quantity specified was lager beer, which costs the consumer about one dollar a gallon. The comparatively small quantities of cider, wine, and ale which enter into the sum total retail at the same rates, at the least. Consequently the appalling fact stands before us, that in the one item of fermented drinks, the national waste, originating in the drinking habits of our people, is increasing at the rate of fifteen millions of dollars annually.

It must be confessed that the returns of the quantity of spirits distilled do not look well. They prove, indeed, that in the year 1866 less than fifteen million gallons paid the tax; that the tax was paid on a little more than seven million gallons in 1868, while the next year but one shows ten times that quantity. It is true that previous to 1869 the tax was two dollars a gallon, and that year it was reduced to fifty cents, but how does this circumstance account for the sudden increase? The supply of brandy, rum, whisky, and the rest, was just as abundant at the hotels and grog-shops in 1868 as in 1869. Was the greater part of it spurious liquor, compounded of water and drugs? Or did vast quantities of liquor find their way to market without paying the tax? No doubt both devices were resorted to without scruple, dealers defrauding the Government or cheating their customers as best suited their own convenience or their sense of safety.

One thing, however, these figures certainly do not prove. They furnish no evidence whatever that, as the use of fermented drinks increases, the use of the more concentrated liquors grows less. The evidence is rather to the effect that they advance with equal steps. The steady growth of the national vice is seen also in the regular increase in the number of liquor dealers, wholesale and retail. The records of the Revenue Department show that in the year 1868 there were 135,636 places of sale which paid tax. In 1872 the number had become 168,420; an increase of 32,784 in four years. This great army of grog-sellers paid taxes; but doubtless another great

army sold alcohol and defrauded the Government. The closest observer can see no evidence that the general use of fermented beverages tends to lessen intemperance, or even diminish, in any perceptible degree, the consumption of the more concentrated alcoholic liquors. Total abstinence is the true platform, the only tenable position.

In 1838 the Rev. Theobald Mathew, a priest of the Roman Catholic Church in the city of Cork, Ireland, became an active laborer in the temperance field, and was the means of accomplishing an immense amount of good. He administered the pledge to 150,000 persons in Cork alone in the space of five months. In Galway, in two days' time, 100,000 took the pledge. He traveled throughout Ireland on his blessed mission; he crossed over to England, and was very successful there. In 1850 he came to America, and was every-where honored, both by Protestants and Catholics, as a public benefactor, and everywhere thousands pledged adherence to the cause which he represented. Dying in 1856, at the age of sixty-six years, after having devoted eighteen years of his life and spent all his property in the prosecution of his philanthropic labors, he will ever be remembered as Ireland's great "Apostle of Temperance."

In 1840 the Washingtonian movement began its brief but wonderful career. Six intemperate drinkers, Mitchell, Hoss, Anderson, Steers, M'Curley, and Campbell, in the city of Baltimore, met Friday evening, April 2, in their accustomed place of resort and suddenly resolved to reform. They drew up a pledge and signed it on the spot, calling themselves the Washingtonian Society. They began to hold public meetings, and told the wondering crowds the simple story of their former evil ways and their escape, and invited every man who was inthralled as they had been to break his chains as they had done and be free. A powerful effect was produced, which spread like circles in water till it reached the remotest part of the land. Crowds attended the meetings of these bold reformers, and thousands took the pledge at their hands. Many of their converts entered the field as lecturers, and Washingtonian Societies sprung up in every direction. In the brief space of about four or five years it is estimated that 150,000 drunkards and 500,000 other persons signed the pledge of total abstinence.

The Washingtonian movement, as a form of active aggression, waned as suddenly as it had grown into magnitude. The causes of its decadence are not difficult to trace. The toper's motley became the only wear for an acceptable lecturer, and a sudden crowd of profuse talkers, for whom no one was responsible, rushed into public notice and took possession of the field. Some were sincere, sensible, and intelligent, and did good service. Others were simply mercenaries, caring only for notoriety and pay. These latter were not long in discovering that the man who could tell the best story secured the largest crowd and the most money. Soon the country was overrun by a multitude of busy men, many of whom were arrogant and ignorant, without character or conscience, and who dealt in professed experiences which were often pure inventions, and sometimes foolish, indelicate, and even profane. The movement broke down, and disappointed its originators and the friends of the cause in general, because it lacked an efficient organization by means of which the intelligence, piety, and sagacity which really existed in its ranks could select its workers and direct their labors.

In September, 1842, the Order of the Sons of Temperance was founded in the city of New York. Prior to this date the societies were organized on the simplest plan. All who signed the pledge and kept it were accounted members. Officers were elected to provide for the holding of public meetings, the circulation of temperance publications, and the securing of signatures to the pledge; but there ended their duties and their powers. Certain ardent friends of the cause, believing that solid strength could be derived from a more compact form of organization, erected the new Society somewhat after the model of the Free Masons and Odd Fellows. The Sons of Temperance have their initiation ceremonies, their pass-words whereby the members are recognized, their weekly meetings, conducted according to the forms provided in the Ritual, and their payments of monthly dues into the treasury, from which, according to the original plan, every member was entitled, in cases of sickness, to draw a certain sum weekly during the continuance of his illness. This last feature of the compact, however, was afterward made optional, each Local Division retaining or laying it aside, as was deemed best. The body is

governed by the National Division, which is composed of delegates from the Grand (or State) Divisions, which are made up of delegates from the Local Divisions or Societies.

In 1845 the Order of the Templars of Honor and Temperance, and in 1851 the Order of Good Templars, were organized on principles substantially the same as those of the Sons of Temperance. Besides these several minor bodies, as the Rechabites and Good Samaritans, were formed, all aiming to do good in the same field. The numbers gathered by these various organizations have been very considerable, and the amount of good done is great. During times of almost general apathy and inactivity the temperance orders maintained their organizations, and often, without aid from other sources, kept a force of lecturers in the field and carried on the war. The warmth of their fellowship, their frequent meetings, and the perpetual warnings and words of encouragement of the ritual, have, in multiplied cases, given strength to the failing purpose of men escaping from the foe, and cheered them in the hours of despondency and fiery trial. All honor to the "Sons," the "Templars," and all other faithful workers in the cause of truth and humanity!

The tide of thought and discussion at length reached the traffic, and began to demand its right to be. The traffic could not bear the examination. It is not only useless, but essentially thievish, treacherous, and murderous. The vender smiles upon his victims, and does all that lies in his power to lure them into his den; and does it with a mean, dishonest intent—the determination to sacrifice to his own avarice all that they ought to hold dear. He knows that he is really their enemy, and that he makes merchandise of the weaknesses and vices of men. He knows well that the path which leads to his shop is the way of death, and that the wise never set foot therein. He knows that the money upon which he lays his pitiless hand is the price of the food and clothing of the victim's family; that for lack of it little innocent children cry for bread, and go barefoot and cold in wintry weather, and wives and mothers, worse than widowed, toil on in direst poverty and suffering, and strive in vain to stem the dark tide that steadily surges against them, sweeping every joy, every hope, every element of their earthly welfare, into a bottomless abyss. He knows that because of his

vile trade the prison and the almshouse are crowded, our taxes burdensome, the streets of our cities unsafe at night, and that every day we hear of violence and murder, and brutal outrage worse than murder.

The logic of the Temperance Reform leads inevitably to the legal suppression of the public sale of alcoholic beverages. The reasoning by which the conclusion is reached is plain. The sale and use of intoxicating drinks are dangerous and burdensome to the community and hostile to the public welfare. Society has a right to protect itself. Whatever a man living alone, like Crusoe on his island, may do, he has no right to make war upon his fellow-citizens and seek to live by plunder. He has no right to be a beast of prey. If he deliberately and of set purpose becomes such he must expect the fate of a beast of prey. For several centuries the license system has existed both in England and America, and all the legislation of the past upon this subject openly concedes that the liquor traffic, dangerous at the best, is very liable to become detrimental to the common good; that it is a proper subject of legal control, and that its demands for toleration are to be held subordinate to the claims of the public welfare. The very idea of a license system involves the principle that no man has a right to engage in the traffic unless the authorities, by specific action, bestow it upon him; and that the question whether the privilege shall be bestowed in a given case is not to be determined by the supposed interests of the applicant, but with reference to the general good. The fact is, the profits of the traffic are so great, and so little of capital, character, and skill is necessary to its prosecution, that there is a constant pressure into it of the indolent, the shiftless, and the vicious. In both England and America, long before the Temperance Reform began its beneficent work, statesmen saw that legal restraint was an absolute necessity.

But the license system, while it may lessen the number of dealers, really lends moral support to the traffic by giving it the sanction of law. As the scales fall from the eyes of the people, they begin to question and reason; and for the last thirty years especially there has been a steady accumulation, first of suspicion, then of conviction, then of determined hostility to such laws. It has come to be the univer-

sal judgment of the friends of the reform that the legal protection of the vile trade is a legal monstrosity, totally at variance, not only with morality and the Christian religion, but with civilization itself.

In a republic, every strong conviction prevalent among the people in regard to matters affecting the general welfare inevitably finds its way to the ballot-box and the legislative hall. In seeking to embody their convictions in forms of law, the friends of reform encountered many obstacles. Not a few of their own number doubted the wisdom of legal measures. Prohibitory legislation in regard to the traffic was new and untried, and it was found difficult to make laws that were free from legal objection, and at the same time efficient. And then the hosts of men who were interested in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks formed a compact body of opponents, organized, alert, untiring, and unscrupulous. This enemy, powerful in numbers, money, and influence among the lower stratum of politicians, made vigorous resistance at the polls, in the halls of legislation, and in the courts.

In almost every State where a prohibitory law was at any time passed, the first attempt took the shape of a test of the popular conviction, the new legislation being submitted to the popular vote before it went into operation. Thus in the State of New York a law prohibiting the public sale of alcoholic drinks was passed in 1845, submitted to the people, and received a large majority; but secret and potent influences secured its repeal in 1847, in spite of the most emphatic remonstrances of the friends of reform. About the same time the same measure was tried in New Jersey, and reached the same result by a similar process. Other States passed through a like experience. Generally, the career of the law consisted of three brief stages: first, the passage of the law, to go into operation if approved by a popular vote; second, the vote of the people approving the measure; third, the decision of the courts that a law so framed as to depend for its existence upon a popular vote is unconstitutional.

In 1851 the Legislature of Maine passed a stringent prohibitory law, in the framing of which the wisdom gained by former failures was made as far as possible available. Going into operation, it was found to be effective, and its very effi-

ciency made the opposition fiercer than ever, and two years after craft and corruption secured its repeal. Again it was made a direct political issue, and the party favoring its re-enactment prevailed by a great majority, and in 1856 the law was established on a foundation not to be shaken. The evil ingenuity of law-breakers has rendered additional provisions necessary from time to time; but the fundamental principle, the total suppression of the traffic in alcohol as a beverage, remains, and shapes all legislation on the subject. And it has wrought wonders, and is still working wonders. The liquor traffic is not wholly annihilated, but its power is destroyed, and its ravages are greatly lessened. Crime, pauperism, vice, the entire brood of depravities that draw their inspiration from the grog-shop, are greatly decreased. Taxes are less burdensome, life and property are safer, and every public interest is advanced. This is the testimony of all impartial and reliable witnesses. To satisfy the last obstinate doubt in regard to this let evidence not to be contradicted speak—the records of the Internal Revenue Department.

It must be remembered that in the books of the revenue office all who sell intoxicating drinks, no matter for what purpose, whether for chemical or medicinal use or as beverages, are classified as dealers, and taxed as such; and that the duty of the revenue officer is simply to collect the tax, whether by the State law the sale may be legal or illegal. Moreover, the revenue officers, receiving their appointments from Washington, are independent of local influences, and have every incentive to do their duty without fear or favor. Consequently their returns are by far the most reliable that can be obtained. We select for comparison with Maine, where prohibition has prevailed seventeen years, the States of New York and New Jersey, where the license system has prevailed for two centuries. The returns include all sales of intoxicating liquors by druggists and all sorts of dealers and for all purposes.

	New York.	New Jersey.	Maine.
Population.....	4,387,464	906,096	626,915
Liquor Taxes.....	$7,111,348	$1,015,925	$85,247
Per Inhabitant.....	$1 62	$1 12	13c.
Places of Sale.....	27,899	6,970	745
Number of Inhabitants to each place of sale.	157	130	841

These returns are for the year ending June 30, 1872. This same year the District of Columbia, with a population of 131,700, paid tax on 1,150 places of sale, or one for 114 inhabitants. The whole number of places of sale paying taxes that year in the United States was 168,420, or one to 231 inhabitants; and the entire amount received in liquor taxes was $57,734,015, or $1 48 to each inhabitant. Any man who, in the face of these facts, will persist in saying "that there is as much liquor drunk in Maine as ever," is beyond the reach of rational conviction.

In Massachusetts a long conflict, with several alternations of victory and defeat, has at length resulted in the fixing of an effective prohibitory law on a firm basis. The law passed in 1867 was regarded as one of the best which had been framed. It prohibited the sale of all intoxicating drinks, including cider and lager beer. In 1871 the liquor interest, by craft and audacity, secured an amendment, by virtue of which the question of the sale of beer and cider was submitted to the popular vote on the local option plan; but it was soon found that wherever the advocates of beer and cider prevailed, all kinds of liquors were sold under the name of beer or cider, and the dark tide of death, which had been so steadily ebbing, began once more to flow, and threatened to be as deep and wide as ever; and at the last session of the Legislature the law was restored to its original form.

A pamphlet of eighty pages, just issued by the Temperance Publication House at New York, lies before us containing an exhibit of the progress of the legal war against intemperance in the various States of the Union. Its pages are calculated to surprise and greatly encourage the friends of reform. One very gratifying fact is that scarce a single State of the Union is at rest on the subject. There is progress on all sides. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Iowa, and Michgan prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks. Pennsylvania, Minnesota, New York, and Louisiana submit the question of license or prohibition to the local vote. In New Jersey public sentiment is moving steadily in the direction of a local option law for the whole State; Vineland in Cumberland County, Chatham in Morris, Montclair in Essex, and Haddon in Camden, have special laws, by virtue of which the question of license or no

licence is periodically submitted to the people, and whenever it has been thus submitted the victory has been with the right. Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin have what is styled a Civil Damage Law, by virtue of which the wife, parent, child, or employer of the inebriate may arraign the vender in a suit at law, and secure compensation, as far as money can do it, for the injuries inflicted. The principle of the Civil Damage Law is wise and just, but a little difficult of application, inasmuch as the inebriated person may have been drinking at a score of places during a single day, and it may not appear which vender is the worst offender. It would be well to add to the law an amendment embodying the plan adopted in some States for the protection of sheep. If the flock is attacked by dogs and damage done, and the cur which did the deed cannot be discovered, or, if discovered, cannot be traced to his owner, then the damages are estimated by the proper officers and assessed upon all the dogs in the county, to be collected with the other regular taxes from the owners of the dogs, and paid to the owner of the sheep destroyed. An amendment, on the Dog Law principle, would give increased efficiency to the Civil Damage Law; nor would it put the liquor traffic below its real level in public estimation. In addition to the States named as having already adopted the Civil Damage Law, strenuous efforts are making in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas to secure the adoption of the principle. Ohio excels all her sister States in one thing: her Constitution expressly forbids the enactment of laws for the protection of the liquor traffic. And thus the contest goes on, and the sky brightens with signs of victory. Real progress has been made. Every year marks an advance. Total abstinence is now the settled doctrine of the reform. The intelligent patriotism and humanity of the age more and more emphatically condemn the manufacture and the traffic as at war with all human welfare, and Christian Churches are fast embodying a condemnation of the murderous business in their disciplinary codes of morals.

The legal questions pertaining to the contest may be deemed at rest. The Supreme Court of the United States has been appealed to, and has decided that each State has the right to restrain the traffic at its pleasure, and even prohibit it altogether,

and that the payment of the Government tax secures no right to sell in defiance of State regulations. The Supreme Courts of New Jersey and Pennsylvania have been appealed to by the opponents of the Local Option Law, and have decided that the principle is not of necessity contrary to the State Constitution, and that the Chatham Law of New Jersey, and the Germantown Law of Pennsylvania, are valid. Thus legal obstacles are disappearing from the path of the reform; and its enemies are driven from the courts and compelled to resort to less pretentious modes of warfare. The foe is still very strong. Not fewer than one million of the population of the United States are employed in making and selling intoxicants, and thus are living upon the weaknesses, the vices, the ruin of their fellow-citizens. The enormous income of the traffic shows it to be the mightiest single moneyed interest of the country. The annual income of all the railroads reaches the total amount of about four hundred millions of dollars. But fermented drinks alone cost our people two hundred and fifty millions, and distilled spirits nearly twice as much. The sum total of the direct alcoholic waste cannot be less than seven hundred millions of dollars a year. A trade with an income like this, no matter how infamous or cruel, will not die easily, nor die at all until it has exhausted all its resources of craft, corruption, fraud, and perhaps violence, to perpetuate its existence. Nevertheless, in the name of God and humanity, a banner has been lifted up against this proud foe, and we expect the victory.

In England, too, public sentiment is steadily gathering volume and force, in opposition to the liquor traffic. The Permissive Bill, which is a proposed law based on the principle of Local Option, has been pending in Parliament for several years; and each succeeding year it has been asked for by a larger body of petitioners, and has received a larger number of votes, than before. Ultimate success is assured.

The curious part of the history is the fact that, considered as a drug, the effect of alcohol upon the human organism is hardly yet determined among scientific men. Till quite recently it was universally considered a stimulant, a substance having power to quicken mental and physical energy for at least a brief period. But later and more careful investigations

have shown that alcohol is in no true sense a stimulant, that its real effect upon a healthy human organization is to cool the blood, lessen the force of the circulation, the muscular vigor, and the sensibility of the nerves; and that it produces this effect in all cases, and from the very beginning of the impression. Consequently, when the man who resorts to the drug for aid, and by its use feels stronger to labor, or warmer in winter's cold, he is a victim of an utter delusion, and verifies the Scripture declaration that *Wine is a mocker.* When this singular discovery becomes generally known, the power of alcohol as a tempter will be very greatly curtailed, and, among those who are not contemplating slow suicide, will be wholly destroyed.

Art. IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF REPROBATION.

Nearly all recent bodies of divinity written from the Calvinistic stand-point exhibit a uniform and somewhat remarkable defect—the important *locus* on Reprobation is entirely omitted. To supply this missing chapter, in a form which will admit of its being bound up in these defective volumes, we here present the doctrine in the exact dogmatic statements of the great theologians of the earlier Calvinistic Churches.

Apart from its dogmatic and historic value, it is hoped that it may prove edifying and comforting to the elect of our time, few of whom, there is reason to fear, appreciate the sweetness and gracious power of the doctrine as did the fathers. Were we publishing it purely for the spiritual benefit of this class, we should be inclined to entitle it "A Summer Morning Ramble Through a Somewhat Neglected Corner of the Calvinistic Garden of Spices."

I. Definition of Reprobation.

1. *Supralapsarian.*—Final reprobation is the decree of God by which, according to his own most free will, for the declaration of his avenging justice, he determined to bestow upon certain men out of the whole human race neither grace nor glory, but to permit them freely to fall into sin, and to leave them in

their sins, and finally to justly condemn them on account of sin.—GOMARUS: *De Reprobatione*, thesis 2.

2. *Sublapsarian.*—Reprobation is the decree of God by which, from the mere good pleasure of his will, he determined to leave certain men, whom he has not elected, in the mass of corruption, and when they have added sin to sin, and become hardened by his just judgment, to punish them eternally, for the manifestation of the glory of his justice.—HEIDEGGER: *Corpus Theologiæ*, book v, 54.

II. PROOF THAT GOD HAS FORMED SUCH A DECREE.

The proof that there exists such a divine decree is sought partly in the following passages of Scripture: Jer. vi, 30; Matt. vii, 23; John xvii, 9; Rom. ix, 22; 1 Pet. ii, 7, 8; Jude. 4; Rev. xiii, 8; xvii, 8; xx, 5; partly in arguments like the following: (1.) If not all have been elected to eternal life then the rest have been reprobated; the former is true, therefore also the latter.* (2.) Whomsoever Christ shall drive away from himself in the last judgment, they surely were reprobated by God from eternity. This proposition is true, since Christ will not drive away from himself those who have been elected. John vi, 37. But Christ will drive many from himself in the last judgment. Matt. vii, 23; viii, 12; xxv, 41. (3.) If not all are sheep, but many are goats and kids who will go away to eternal punishment, then they were reprobated by God. But that is true, as teaches the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. Christ declares the same to the Jews, John x, 26. (4.) If there are those for whom Christ prayed not, for whom his death is not efficacious, who are of the world, then have they been reprobated by God. But the first is true, as Christ testifies, (John xvii,) therefore the last also. (5.) If any have been reprobated, then there is reprobation. The former is true, therefore the latter also. The examples of Cain, Ham, Ishmael, Esau, and Judas Iscariot prove the assumption.—POLANUS: *Syntagma Theol. Christ.*, iv, 10.

Let us proceed to show that there is such a purpose in

* Many, as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated; but this is exceedingly foolish and puerile, since election itself could not stand unless opposed to reprobation. Whom God passes by, he reprobates.—CALVIN: *Institutio*, (1585,) lib. iii, cap. xxiii, 7.

God as is commonly called reprobation. It appears from what has been already said that it is necessarily implied in the idea of election, so that having proved the one we have virtually proved the other. Election and rejection are correlative terms, and men impose on themselves, and imagine they conceive what it is impossible to conceive, when they admit election and deny reprobation. When of several objects some are chosen, the rest are rejected. It is to no purpose to say that nothing has been done to them, but that they are left in the state in which they were found. In one sense this is true, and in another it is not true; because, as they might have been chosen, but were not, there has been an act of the mind refusing to choose them. The person to whom they were presented has said, "These will I take and those I will not take."—Dr. John Dick: *Theology*, vol. i, p. 368.

III. Why God has Reprobated the Reprobate.

Esau, while yet unpolluted by any sin, is hated. For the ground of predestination is not in works. The apostle does not say that God requited Esau according to his wickedness, but is content with a different solution, namely, that for this purpose reprobates are stirred up to opposition, [*excitentur*,] that through them the glory of God may be shown forth. Wherefore he declares that God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will be hardeneth. Do you see that he refers each to the will of God alone? We have no reason, save that so it pleases him.—Calvin: *Institutio*, lib. iii, cap. xxii, 11.

The cause of reprobation was neither foreseen unbelief, nor foreseen sin, nor hatred of God toward the reprobate, but solely the good pleasure (*ἐυδοκία*) of God.—Scharpius: *Cursus Theol.*, Geneva, 1620, p. 309.

As the foreseen faith and good works of the saints were not the cause of their election, so the foreseen unbelief of the wicked, or other sins, were by no means the cause of their reprobation by God; but as he elected those in Christ according to the purpose of his own will, so he reprobated these according to the same purpose of his will.—Zanchius: *De Natura Dei*, p. 711.

The chief efficient cause of reprobation is God, the impell-

ing cause the good pleasure of God.—ALSTED: *Theol. Schol.*, p. 214.

If the efficient cause of the decree of reprobation were sin then would an eternal decree of God depend upon men.—POLANUS: *Syntagma Theol.*, p. 1616.

The design of reprobation is twofold: (1) the glory of God, which glory reprobation serves to show forth in two ways, namely, by manifesting God's power and supreme right to do with his creatures what he will, and by commending the mercy of God toward the elect; (2) the salvation of the elect.—SCHARPIUS: *Ibid.*, p. 309.

As Christ is the cause, not of election, but of salvation, so unbelief is the cause, not of reprobation, but of condemnation. —WOLLEBIUS: *Theol. Christ., Compendium*, p. 23.

Reprobation, not less than election, is considered either absolutely with respect to one, or comparatively and relatively with respect to many. In the former sense it may be asked, Why has God reprobated this or that one? It may be answered, Because on account of sin he was deserving who was reprobated. Not that sin can fitly be the cause of reprobation, else all would have been reprobated; but because it is the condition and precedent quality, whence arises in man the possibility of reprobation. In the latter sense it may be asked, Why has God reprobated this one rather than that one, when both were equally sinners and hence could be reprobated? Here it is not possible to allege sin, since that is common to both. And no cause can be assigned save only the good pleasure of God, since so it has pleased him.—RIISSEN: *Turretini Compend. Theol., auctum et illustratum*, (Amstel., 1695,) lib. vi, c. 17.

The chief end of reprobation is the glory of God, the glory of his wrath and of his justice, the glory of his power and of his most free sovereignty; the subordinate end with respect to the elect is that from his severity toward others they may rightly recognize the goodness of God to themselves; with respect to the reprobate, their just damnation on account of sins. —ALTINGIUS: *Opera Omnia*, (Amstel., 1687,) *Meth. Theol. Didat.*, 39.

The reason why God has decreed thus to choose certain men, and others not, is simply and solely his own good pleasure

and mere grace; not that he foresaw that one would believe in Christ and another not.—*Contraremonst. Coll. Hag.*, p. 58.

To say that God reprobated certain men on account of foreseen unbelief is blasphemy against God, from whom in this way his right is taken, his glory snatched away.—PARÆUS: *in Epist. Rom.*, ix, 13, p. 841.

The supreme end of reprobation is the glory of God, as the apostle says: God hath prepared vessels of wrath for destruction, that he might make known to the world both his wrath and his power. The subordinate end is the salvation of the elect, for God on this account has reprobated very many, that he might thus publish the riches of his glory toward the vessels of mercy. On this account also he has reprobated many, that in the elect he might excite awe before his power, and might declare the greatness of his grace toward the elect in that he has not reprobated them also, when nevertheless he could have done so. The accessory end is the destruction of reprobates, not for its own sake, inasmuch as that destruction is itself an evil, but as accessory in so far as it is a means serving to manifest the glory of God and to assist in the salvation of the elect.—ALSTEDT: *Ibid.*, p. 219.

It may be supposed, indeed, that we need not resolve the decree of reprobation into the sovereignty of God, as sufficient reason for it may be found in the moral character of its objects, who, being considered as fallen and guilty creatures, may be presumed to have been rejected on this account. But although this may seem at first sight to have been the cause of their reprobation, yet, upon closer attention, we shall see reason to change our opinion. It is obvious that if they had not been considered as fallen they would not have been rejected, unless we adopt the Supralapsarian hypothesis, which affirms that they were viewed only as creatures, and that by that uncontrolled power which may make one vessel to dishonor and another to honor, their appointment to perdition, for the glory of divine justice, was prior to the purpose to permit them to fall. There is something in this system repugnant to our ideas of the character of God, whom it represents rather as a despot than the Father of the universe. But although their fall is presupposed to their reprobation, it will appear that the former was not the reason of the latter, if we recollect that those who were chosen

to salvation were exactly in the same situation. Both classes appeared in the eyes of God to be guilty, polluted, and worthy of death. Their sinfulness, therefore, could not be the reason of rejection in the one case, since it did not cause rejection in the other. If it was the reason why some were passed by, it would have been a reason why all should be passed by. As then it did not hinder the election of some, it could not be the cause which hindered the election of others. You ought not to think that there is too much refinement and subtilty in this reasoning. If you pay due attention to the subject you will perceive that, as the moral state of all was the same, it could not be the cause of the difference in their destination. If there was sin in the reprobate, there was sin also in the elect; and we must therefore resolve their opposite allotment into the will of God, who gives and withholds his favor according to his good pleasure.—Dr. John Dick: *Theology*, vol. i, p. 369.

Although the corruption of nature, which is dispersed over all mankind, before it come into action is available enough unto condemnation, whereby followeth that Esau was worthily rejected because he was naturally the son of wrath; yet, lest any doubt should remain, as though through respect of any fault or sin his condition was the worse, it was necessary as well sins as virtues should be excluded. Surely, true it is, that the *next* cause of reprobation is for that we are all accursed in Adam, yet, to the end we might learn to rest in the bare, simple will of God, Paul did lead us aside from the consideration thereof for so long until he had established this doctrine, namely, that God hath a sufficient, just cause of election and reprobation in his own will or pleasure.—Calvin: *Commentary on Romans*, ix, 11.

There is, indeed, no cause of reprobation in the reprobate that they rather than others are passed by of God; that is wholly from the unsearchable depths of God's own free will and good pleasure.—Archbishop Usher: *Body of Div.*, (Robinson's Ed., p. 113.)

IV. What Reprobation Includes.

Reprobation includes two acts of the divine will. These are, according to the Supralapsarian scheme, (1) "foreordination of sin," and (2) "precondemnation of sinners;" according to the

Sublapsarian view, (1) "præterition," that is, "the refusal of grace not owed to the sinner," and (2) "precondemnation," that is, "appointment to deserved punishment."

1. *Supralapsarian Doctrine.*—The act of reprobation is twofold. The first is the determination to abandon certain men, and to manifest justice by means of them. Of this act the final cause can be given, the impelling cause apart from God cannot be given. For it springs from the mere good pleasure of God, having no regard to good or evil in the creature. For the will of God is the cause of causes. There, then, it must be rested, and apart from or beyond that no reason must be sought; indeed, beyond it there is nothing. Hence every man, as Paul asserts, is to God as a mass of clay in the hand of the potter. Hence also God did not *find*, but by virtue of his own right *made* ,vessels for wrath. . . The *second* act is the appointment to punishment or just destruction. This appointment may by different modes of thought be distinguished into simple and comparative. Simple appointment is that in which, for example, Peter or John is ordained to punishment. This ordination is by the most just will of God, not, however, without regard to original or actual sin. For as men are actually condemned on account of sin, so God has decreed to condemn them on account of the same sin. Yet sin is not the cause of the decree of reprobation, but in the divine foreknowledge it precedes in order, not indeed the former, but this latter act. Comparative appointment is when one and not another, this one rather than that one, in the same condition, is appointed to punishment. The cause of this comparative reprobation is the will of God alone, even without regard to sin.—PERKINS: *De Prædest., et Gratia Dei.*

He who wills an end necessarily wills also the means which are necessary to secure the end. Hence for the manifestation of mercy and justice in remitting and punishing sin, sin is necessary.—PISCATORIUS: *in Resp. ad Apol. Bertii*, p. 130.

God therefore gave to man a commandment that man might transgress it, and he himself in this way obtain occasion to punish him.—*Ibid.*, p. 50.

We say that it was effected by the counsel and will of God that Adam should fall, and that we all should fall into this

wretched state in which we are now entangled.—CALVIN: *Institutio*, lib. iii, cap. xxi, 7.

To sin nevertheless, although it be sin, both the elect and the reprobate were foreordained, since from it the glory of God was to be manifested by his goodness.—ZARCHIUS: *De Natura Dei*, p. 722.

God made man with this design that he might in fact fall, since only in this way could he arrive at those chief ends.—PISCATORIUS: *Contra Schafm.*, p. 29.

God ordained even the fall itself of the first man, and decreed that it should happen, and that from eternity, just as he decreed from eternity the creation of man.—DANAEUS: *in Isagog.*, p. 144.

Although in the sin of Adam that was done which by the decree of God had been appointed to come to pass, yet that decree was not known to Adam, since God wished he should sin. —*Ibid.*, p. 149.

It is false to say God has no need of the sinner. He has need of him for the manifestation of his glory. It is impossible that God could in any other way arrive at his purposed end.—PISCATORIUS: *Resp. ad Apol. Bertii*, p. 44.

If God has made the wicked for punishment, it follows that he may also have made him for sin, since unless sin had preceded, he could not justly inflict punishment upon him.—PISCATORIUS: *Contra Hemming, de Grati Dei*, p. 76.

2. *Infralapsarian Doctrine.*—First of all to be discriminated is the twofold act of reprobation; for although on the part of God it is finished by an act, one and most simple, yet in view of our inadequate way of conceiving it, it is customary for theologians to divide it into two, in order to facilitate our knowledge of the thing; the former of which acts is termed negative, the latter affirmative or positive. That refers to the passing by, this to the condemnation beforehand. The *negative* act includes two, first, the omission by which in the election of others, first to grace, then to glory, he neglected and slighted these, as appears from the result of election; second, negative desertion by which he left them in the corrupt mass and in their own misery. . . The *positive* act, which is called forecondemnation, includes two: first, appointment to damnation, by which the vessels of wrath are fitted for destruction;

then appointment to the intermediate judgments, chief among which is blinding and hardening, which pertain to the lost alone.—F. TURRETIN: *Inst. Theol.*, i, 419, 420.

In teaching of reprobation we distinguish two acts, namely, the denial of grace not owed the sinner, which is called preterition, and appointment to due punishment, which is called precondemnation.—WOLLEBIUS: *Comp.*, p. 23.

The nature of reprobation as a whole is summed up in these particulars, to wit: that God, first, as autocrat or supreme Lord, by his own will alone disposing of those who from the nature of that disposition are termed reprobates, passed by certain men, lying in the common mass of sinners and therefore not worse than others; then, as just judge decreeing damnation to no one save the sinner, to show forth the glory of his justice, appointed the same to destruction, and in the same decree ordained the means appropriate to this end. He moreover passed them by in the preparation both of glory and of grace. In the preparation of glory, since he prepared the kingdom of heaven for the blessed of his Father only. Matt. xxv, 34, 41. In the preparation of his grace, inasmuch as he did not give them to the Son as equally to be redeemed and as elect. John xvii, 9; Matt. xiii, 11; xi, 26.—HEIDEGGER: *Corpus Theol.*, v, p. 56.

Reprobation is the decree of God to leave certain men in sin and to condemn them on account of sin. It includes in itself a twofold act. The first is God's determination to abandon certain men and to leave them to themselves. This act is absolute, depending upon the sole and absolute will of God. The other act is the determination to damn on account of sin. This act is not absolute, but has regard to and is conditioned upon sin.—KECKERMANN: *Systema Theol.*, p. 172.*

V. MEANS BY WHICH GOD EXECUTES THIS DECREE.

The foreordained "means appropriate to this end" mentioned in the last extract but one are as follows: Abandonment of the

* I am disposed to doubt, notwithstanding the opinion of divines to the contrary, whether this purpose [appointment to punishment] is any part of the decree of reprobation, which properly consists in passing by its objects or rejecting them. The dooming of them to perdition seems to belong to a different decree, especially as it is founded on a different cause. They were appointed to wrath for their sins, but it was not for their sins, as we have shown, but in the exercise of sovereignty, that they were rejected.—DR. JOHN DICK: *Theology*, vol. i, p. 370.

reprobate, separation of them from Christ and the grace of redemption or reconciliation, omission of the call, or only an ineffectual call, retention of sins, blinding or hardening, and final impenitence.—HEIDEGGER: *Corpus*, v, 65.

What are the proper means of executing God's decree to reprobate men? Their number is six. (1) The infinite number of actual sins. (2) Unbelief, or alienation and separation from Christ. (3) Abandonment—either no call or an ineffectual one by the preaching of the word, or no inward response to the call. (4) Pertinacity, or the hardening and blinding in sin. (5) A perpetual turning away from God, arising from the above; scorn, and progress from sin to sin. (6) At length their just condemnation follows.—BUCANUS: *Inst. Theol.*, (Geneva, 1609,) lib. xxxvi, 39.

He who with any seriousness wills an end, wills and prepares also, as far as he can, the means necessary to attain it, especially if he hold all things in his own hand and they depend upon him alone.—TURRETIN: *Inst.*, i, p. 40.

The means of carrying out this reprobation, or rather the consequences resulting from such eternal reprobation, are that God denies to the wicked, when they are born into this world, his grace and the word and doctrine of the Gospel wholly and entirely, or at least that inner illumination of heart and that grace by which they would be able to respond to the Gospel call, and leaves them to their natural blindness and hardness. Indeed, they are surrendered to Satan, who worketh in them, and are given to him for a prey.—ZEPPERUS: *Inst. de Prædest.*, p. 18.

Upon reprobation follow deprivation of grace, hence sin, then sin as punishment of sin, to all which God has foreordained the reprobate from all eternity.—ZANCHIUS: *De Nat. Dei*, p. 620.

This, then, was the first thing which from eternity God determined concerning reprobates, namely, the appointment of certain men to everlasting destruction. To this end, moreover, their sins were ordained, also their abandonment to sin and denial of grace.—*Ibid.*, p. 740.

Three things follow upon reprobation: deprivation of grace, sin, and punishment of sin.—GOMARUS: *Disput. de Prædest.*

We admit it to be true that God has predestinated whom he would, not only to damnation, but also to the causes of damnation.—BEZA: *De Natura Dei*, p. 417.

We grant that the reprobate, constrained by this decree of God, are under the necessity of sinning and of perishing in sin; yea, so constrained that they cannot but sin and perish.—ZANCHIUS: *Ibid.*, p. 744.

"Whosoever are not predestinated to salvation are necessarily damned on account of their sins." Most true. Nevertheless, if the *necessarily* were stricken out it would less offend the weak.—ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT: *Works*, iii, p. 613.

God hath predestinated not only unto damnation, but also unto the causes of it, whomsoever he saw fit.—BEZA: *Lib. de Prædest.*, p. 4.

It is certain that God is the first cause of obduration. Reprobates are held so fast under God's almighty decree that they cannot but sin and perish.—ZANCHIUS: *De Excœcat.*, p. 5.

VI. WHAT PROPORTION OF THE HUMAN RACE WERE REPROBATED.

The difference appears in the *fewness* of believers. Election is not common to all. The world does not belong to its Creator, except that from God's malediction, wrath, and death eternal grace has snatched *not many*, leaving "*the world*" in its destruction.—CALVIN: *Institutio*, iii, xxii, 7.

If only a *few* have been elected, then the rest have been reprobated.—SCHARPIUS: p. 303.

Mercy is not universal—but of the lost *some* out of every nation are saved.—WENDELINUS: *Systema*, p. 184.

God has reprobated *very many*, (*plurimos*) that thus he might publish the riches of his glory toward the vessels of mercy.—ALSTEDT: p. 219.

Unbelief is a consequent of reprobation.—TURRETIN: i, p. 425. Out of many *scarce a few* believe.—*Consensus Genevensis*, p. 254.

Every one is held by command of God to believe himself to be among those *few*, (elect.)—GOMARUS: *De Prædest.*, thesis viii.

Scripture plainly teaches that not all, but only *some*, have been elected.—ALTING: *Syllab. Controv.*, p. 159.

Election from that misery to salvation is *special*, and the passing by of the *very many* (*plurimorum*) unchanged, whom God has ordained to leave in their misery by a sentence most free, but yet most just.—TURRETIN: i, p. 439.

God does not will that they should be saved whom he does not will to call by his word to faith and salvation. For to whom the means are denied, to them the end also must be thought to be denied. But from unnumbered men God has withheld the preaching of the word, which is the only means to faith and salvation; as under the Old Testament from all Gentiles, under the New hitherto from various peoples upon whom the light of the Gospel has never dawned and who yet lie in the thickest darkness of paganism.—TURRETIN: i, p. 443.

The love which is spoken of (John iii, 16) when it is said, "God so loved the world," etc., cannot be universal toward all and each, but is *special* toward a *few*.—*Ibid*, i, p. 446.

But now, alas! I know that by far the greatest part of wretched men are to be unworthy of mercy and grace, and that very few (*paucissimos*) will oppose no barrier to my grace. —STEPH. VITUS: *Defensio Apologiæ Synodi Dordraceni et Reform. Fidei*, (Cassellis, 1726,) p. 230.

Are all the elect, the seed, the saved, the vessels of mercy, the chosen and peculiar? Are not some, yea, *the most*, the children of the flesh, the rest, the lost, the vessels of wrath, of dishonor, and the children of perdition?—JOHN BUNYAN: *Reprobation Asserted*, vol. iii of Whole Works, p. 337.

Neither do we rashly define the number of the one or of the other; howbeit the Scriptures in dyvers places affirmeth Christes flocke to be the litle flocke, the nomber to be few that findeth the way that leadeth unto life.—JOHN KNOX: *On Predestination*, sec. 2.

VII. REPROBATE INFANTS.

That there is an election and reprobation of infants as well as of adults we cannot deny against God, who tenderly loves and inculpably hates them before they are born.—*Acta Dordrechtana, Judicia Theologorum Exteriorum*, p. 37.

Of the infants of *believers only*, who die of an age before they can be indoctrinated, we determine that they are saved. —*Acta Dordrechtana*, p. 58.

Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth.—*Westminster Confession*, chap. x, 3.

The execution of God's decree in the case of reprobate infants is in this way: When first born they are left to themselves on account of the guilt of original sin, and, dying, they are eternally reprobated.—PERKINS: *Armill.*, p. 219.

How does God suffer them to run into condemnation? In divers manners: Some reprobates dying infants, others of riper years, of which latter sort some are not called, others called.

How does God deal with reprobates' dying infants? Being once conceived they are in a state of death (Rom. v, 14) by reason of the sin of Adam imputed and of original corruption cleaving to their nature, wherein also dying they perish.—ARCHBISHOP USHER: *Body of Divinity*, p. 165.

If, however, I were asked concerning the little children of *Christians* who pass away without the sacrament, I would answer that good hope for them is to be cherished.—MARTYR: *Loci Com.*, p. 137.

Neither Zwingle, nor Calvin, nor any of us indiscriminately gather into heaven with the blessed all infants who die without baptism, either in the mother's womb, or in birth, or while being carried to baptism; but concerning infants of the Church alone, born in the covenant, if they are prevented by death, by the rule of charity they thus pronounce from the special privilege of the promise made in covenant to parents and to children, "I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed;" yet without violating the election of God, which, as formerly in the children of Abraham and of Isaac, so since their time in the children of believers, often has made and does make a discrimination, neither to be searched out nor scoffed at, but to be adored. Rom. ix, 11. This is our opinion and the constant opinion of our doctors on this question.—PARÆUS: *De Amissione Gratiæ*, vi, p. 891.

What other than the good pleasure of God is the cause why the fall of Adam involved in eternal and remediless death whole nations with their infant offspring?—CALVIN: *Inst.*, lib. iii., cap. xxiii, 7.

Infants are deservedly damned on account of the nature they have, to wit, a wicked nature, repugnant to the laws of God.—ZANCHIUS: *Op. Theol.*, iv, i, 4, thesis v.

Many thousands, even all the infants of Turks and Saracens dying in original sin, are tormented by Him in hell fire.—

TWISSE, (Prolocutor of the Westminister Assembly:) *Vindiciæ Grat. Potest. et Prov. Dei.*

The affirmative thesis of the Orthodox is this, The children of unbelievers are in the judgment of God obnoxious to eternal death solely on account of original sin, adult unbelievers both on account of that and on account of actual sin.—ALTING, (of the Synod of Dort:) *Theol. Elenct.*, p. 384.

The following are CALUMNIES: . . . Third, that we hold and teach the salvation of all infants, indiscriminately, who die without baptism. No truly orthodox theologian has ever said or written this. Neither Zwingle, nor Calvin, nor any other of like note has so taught. We make a distinction between the infants of believers and of unbelievers. The former, if by death precluded the possibility of baptism, being born in the covenant, we account saved, and this on the ground of the covenant promise made to the parents along with their seed. The latter class, being not less than their parents outside the covenant, and aliens to the promises of grace, we leave to the just judgment of God.—ALTING: *Ibid.*, p. 377.

If it be asked whether every elect infant is actually sanctified and united in Christ in and by baptism, we must here also distinguish of elect infants baptized: some of whom die in infancy and never come to the use of reason, others God hath appointed to live and enjoy the ordinary means of faith and salvation. With respect to elect infants that die in their infancy, and have no outward means of grace but their baptism, doubtless the inward grace is united to the outward signs.—ARCHBISHOP USHER: *Body of Div.*, p. 501.

These [prerogatives of infant members of the covenant] are not to be stretched to the point of supposing that all the children of pious parents are ordained to salvation. For the Holy Scriptures and daily experience prove that the offspring of the best mature into the very worst condition of soul and are persistent to their own destruction.—WITSIUS: *Miscel. Sac.*, ii, 615.

Neither must it be thought that I would promise salvation unto all the children of the faithful which depart without the sacrament. . . . I dare not promise certain salvation, particularly unto any that departeth hence. For there be some children of the saints which belong not unto predestination.—MARTYR: *Commonplaces*, (Martin's Trans.,) vol. i, p. 233.

The children of the godly, departing in that baptism, may be saved . . . if they appertain to the number of such as be predestinate.—MARTYR: *Ibid.*, vol. iv., 187.

What is to be judged of the soul of a child so killed, having as yet not received the sacrament? I answer that we either as touching his salvation or condemnation can affirm nothing on either side. For if he pertain to the number of the elect so that he was predestinate to eternal life, there is no cause but that he may be saved. But if he were a vessel to that end made of God, to show forth in him his wrath, and so to be condemned, what can we complain of the severity of God, especially seeing we are all born children of wrath and of condemnation?—MARTYR: *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 110.

Adoption is offered in circumcision to all who are circumcised, but the elect alone receive it, whose eyes God has opened that they may see and be saved. The rest, to whom God has not vouchsafed this grace, are left to his righteous judgment, and yet God remains true. The same takes place in baptism, which many thousand infants receive, who yet are never regenerated, but perish forever.—BEZA: *Acta Colloq.*, *Montis Bellig.*, p. 479.

VIII. WHY GOD CREATED REPROBATES.

Creation of reprobates is a fruit of reprobation.—FESTUS HOMMIUS: *Notæ ad Catech.*, p. 216.

For all are not created in an equal condition, but to some eternal life, to others eternal damnation, is foreordained.—CALVIN: iii, xxi, 5.

Whom, therefore, He has created for the abuse of life and the end of death, that they might be the organs of his wrath and example of his severity, in order that they may come to their own end, he sometimes deprives of the power to hear his word, sometimes by the preaching of it further blinds and stupefies.—CALVIN: iii, xxiv, 12.

Certain men have been made by God, the Creator, for destruction.—BEZA: *ad Rom.*, ix, 22.

God determined to make men for different destinies; to wit, some to enjoy eternal salvation, but others to suffer eternal torments, or for eternal destruction.—MACCOVIUS: *De Prædest.*, thesis viii.

The wicked have been intentionally created that they might perish.—CALVIN: *Com. Rom.*, ix, 18.

That some were created by God that they might perish seems absurd on its very face, yet so Scripture declares.—MARTYR: *Loci Com.*, p. 994.

Those whom God has predestined to everlasting destruction he also creates for everlasting destruction. To them all those things are for eternal ruin which to the elect are for salvation. —POLANUS: *in Oseam*, xiii, 9.

IX. WHY GOD VOUCHSAFES TO REPROBATES AN EXTERNAL VOCATION AND THE USE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE.

Lo! He directs to them his voice; but it is that they may become more deaf; he kindles a light, but it is that they may be rendered more blind; he proffers instruction, but it is that they may come more besotted; he presents the remedy, but it is that they may not be healed.—CALVIN: *Institutio*, iii, xxiv, 13.

Nor can it be controverted that to those whom God wills not to be enlightened, he propounds his doctrine involved in riddles, that its only effect may be to increase their stupidity. —*Ibid.*

Since they [the reprobate] before Christ is preached to them were dead in sins and exposed to damnation by transgression of the law, it necessarily follows that the preaching of Christ to them is for an aggravation of their condemnation. And this is the purpose of God when he commands that Christ be preached to the reprobate.—DONTECLOCKIUS: *Contra Anonym.*, cap. iii.

The elect only are drawn to faith by God with an omnipotent power which they cannot themselves resist. The reprobate, on the other hand, though they may frequent the place of worship, hear the word of God, use the sacraments, etc., yet cannot be enlightened by these; but all these means result with them in aggravating their condemnation, since doubtless God has willed to declare his glory through their destruction.—REVIUS: *Resp. ad Apol.*, p. 36.

Accordingly to the reprobate all things work together for evil, the vices of the reprobate themselves, and even their good

things, to wit, the grace of God and gifts of the Holy Spirit.—ZANCHIUS: *De Nat. Dei*, p. 644.

That they [the reprobate] may come to their end, he sometimes deprives them of power to hear his word, sometimes by its preaching further blinds and stupefies them.—CALVIN: iii, xxiv, 12, 24.

X. JUSTICE AND PROPRIETY OF UNCONDITIONAL REPROBATION.

Wherefore God cannot be charged with injustice, even if he has destined and created some to destruction. His right to do so is twofold: First, the absolute authority of lordship, then the subordinate and relative (because he regards sin) right of judgment.—GOMARUS: *De Prædes.*, xxvii.

But when God necessitates a man to sin, that he may punish him on account of sin, he does it justly, since he has power to govern man as he will.—PISCATORIUS: *Resp. ad Dupl. Vorstii*, p. 223.

Not only, then, by that authority alone is God permitted to sentence an innocent creature to tortures infinite in duration, but also to those unmeasured in greatness and severity, if the creature is capable of them. For when supreme right has been placed in authority, as great as is that authority so great must also be that right.—AMYRALDUS: *Dissert. Theol.*, ii.

Although God by this abandonment denies to man that without which sin cannot be avoided, the causality of sin cannot on this account be attributed to him; because (1) God denies it of right, nor is he bound to give that grace to any one; (2) the power to sin, which man of himself possesses, does not result from that deprivation, but only there is no healing of that weakness; (3) God denies grace which they themselves are not willing to accept nor to retain, and which, moreover, they reject, since nothing do they less desire than to be ruled by the Holy Spirit; (4) he does not deny that grace that they may sin, but that they may perish on account of sin.—TURRETIN: *Institutio Theol.*, i, p. 420.

Although the reprobate are appointed to condemnation and to the causes of condemnation, and are created that they may live wickedly, and are vessels full of the dregs of sin, yet it does not hence follow that the absolute decree of reprobation is the cause of all the sins and crimes in the world; since be-

side the sins and crimes of the reprobate in the world other sins and crimes also are committed, to wit, by the elect.—PISCATORIUS: *Contra Taufr.*, p. 47.

It cannot be doubted but that God has reprobated certain men from eternity. Without this appointment the greatest part of men might rush on to their end without any design of God, and in the uncertain issue might not allow the exercise of that justice and judgment which God should have ordained from eternity; and this cannot without impiety be thought of God, the supreme Lord of all things, and the separater, at once merciful and just, of good and bad.—HEIDEGGER: *Ibid.*, v, 55.

It is a thousand times better and more reasonable that each and all creatures in heaven and in earth should by their eternal perdition contribute to manifest the glory and majesty of God, than that the slaughter of a single flea or a fly should serve to demonstrate the dignity of all the men in the world.—PERKINS: *Symbol.*, p. 471.

We say, therefore, that the power of God over his creatures rests upon his sole authority, upon the excellency and pre-eminence of his divine nature, and upon his greatness. From which it follows that God may reprobate a man, appoint him to death, deny him effectual grace, impute to him the sin of another, and punish him on account of it; in short, may put him under obligation to what is impossible, and ruin him without ill desert.—SZYDLOVIUS: *Vindiciæ quæstionum aliquot difficilium et controversarum in Theologia*, (Franek.,) cap. xii.

God chose some, and reprobated the rest, for this reason only, that he might manifest the glory of his power in handling those that were equal unequally.—PISCATOR: *Thesis*, 115.

God found men in sin; and in leaving them there he did no wrong, and was chargeable with no cruelty.—DR. JOHN DICK: *Theology*, vol. i, p. 370.

So great is the majesty of God, and so absolute his dominion, as that he is obnoxious to no laws, obligations, or ties from his creature; this absolute justice or dominion regards not any qualities or conditions in its object, but God can by virtue hereof inflict the highest torments on his innocent creature, and exempt from punishment the most *nocent*. By this absolute justice or dominion God can inflict the greatest torments even

of hell itself on the most innocent creature.—THEOPH. GALE: *Court of the Gentiles*, iv, p. 367.

The reprobate shall be first dispatched, [in the day of judgment,] that the righteous may rejoice to see the vengeance, and, as it were, wash their feet in the blood of the wicked.—ARCHBISHOP USHER: *Body of Div.*, p. 545.

Then to the bar all they drew near
Who died in infancy,
And never had or good or bad
Effected personally;
But from the womb unto the tomb
Were straightway carried,
(Or, at the least, ere they transgressed;)
Who thus began to plead:

"If for our own transgression
Or disobedience,
We here did stand at thy left hand,
Just were the recompense:
But Adam's guilt our souls hath spilt,
His fault is chargéd on us;
And that alone hath overthrown
And utterly undone us.

"Not we, but he ate of the tree,
Whose fruit was interdicted;
Yet on us all of his sad fall
The punishment's inflicted;
How could we sin, that had not been?
Or how is his sin ours,
Without consent; which to prevent
We never had a power?

* * * * *

"Behold we see Adam set free,
And saved from his trespass:
Whose sinful fall hath spilt us all,
And brought us to this pass.
Canst thou deny us once to try,
Or grace to us to tender,
When he finds grace before thy face,
That was the chief offender?"

Then answeréd the Judge most dread,
"God doth such doom forbid,
That men should die eternally
For what they never did.
But what you call old Adam's fall,
And only his trespass,
You call amiss to call it his,
Both his and yours it was.

"He was designed of all mankind
To be a public head,
A common root, whence all should shoot,
And stood in all their stead.
He stood and fell, did ill or well,
Not for himself alone
But for you all, who now his fall
And trespass would disown.

"If he had stood then all his brood
Had been established
In God's true love, never to move,
Nor once awry to tread;
Then all his race my Father's grace
Should have enjoyed forever,
And wicked sprights by subtle slights
Could then have harmed never.

* * * * *

"You sinners are, and such a share
As sinners may expect
Such you shall have, for I do save
None but my own elect.
Yet to compare your sin with their
Who lived a longer time,
I do confess yours is much less,
Though every sin's a crime.

"A crime it is; therefore in bliss
You may not hope to dwell;
But unto you I shall allow
The easiest room in hell."
The glorious King thus answering,
They cease, and plead no longer;
Their consciences must need confess
His reasons are the stronger.

Thus all men's pleas the Judge with ease
Doth answer and confute,
Until that all, both great and small,
Are silenced and mute.
Vain hopes are cropped, all mouths are stopped,
Sinners have nought to say,
But that 'tis just and equal most
They should be damned for ay.

But who can tell the plagues of hell,
And torments exquisite?
Who can relate their dismal state
And terrors infinite?

Who fare the best, and feel the least,
Yet feel that punishment
Whereby to nought they should be brought
If God did not prevent.
—Dr. E. Wigglesworth: *Day of Doom*, (6th ed., 1715.)

Because that now I have to do not onely with a blasphemer, but even (as it were) with a Devill incarnate, my first and chief defense is to say, The Lord putte silence to thee, O Sathan! The Lord confound thy dispiteful counselles, by the which thou studiest to pervert the righteous way of the eternall God!

But now of thee, O blasphemous mouth, I aske, If thou be able to forge to thee and to thy pestilent faction another God then that God who most justly did drowne and destroy by water all living creatures in earth, except so many as were preserved in the arke with Noah; who also did destroye by fire from heaven Sodom and Gomorra, with the cities adjacent, and the whole inhabitents of the same, Lot and his two daughters onely reserved; who further by the space of four thousand yeres did suffer all nations to walk in their owne wayes, revealing only his good-will and the light of his Word to the seede of Abraham (to those that descended of Jacob, I mean:) canst thow, I say, forge to thyself another God then this Eternall Majestie of our God whom we do reverence, in whom we trust and most stedfastly beleve; whose Sonne Jesus Christ we preach to be the onely Saviour of his Church, and whose eternall veritie we mainteine, not onely against Jewe, Turke, and Papist, but also against you enraged Anabaptistes, who can admitte in God no justice which is not subject to the reach of your reason? Darest thou and thy conspiracie, stand up and accuse God of crueltie, because that in these his workes, thou canst not deny but that mo [more] were punnished then were preserved; mo were left in darkness then were called to the true light? Shall not his mercie exceed in all his workes, except that he save the Devill, and those that justely be reprobated as he is? Stoupe, Sathan, under the empire of our Soveraigne God, whose will is so free that nothing is able to constreigne or bind it. For that is onely libertie that is not subject to mutabilitie, to the inconstancie or appetites of others, as most blasphemously you wold imagine God to be

in his election and most just reprobation. By the which, in despite of Sathan, of thee his slave and sonne, and of all thy sect, he will declare his glorie, as well in punnishing with tormentes forever such blasphemers as you be, as in shewing the riches of his glorie to the members of his dear Sonne, who onely depend upon Christ Jesus and upon his justice.

To purge my God from that injustice or from those absurdities which thou woldest impute upon his Eternall Majestie I will not labor, lest that either I should seem to doubt of our own cause, either yet to be sollicite for the defense of our Eternall God. And therefore, seeing that ye declare yourselves, not men ignorant, willing to learne, but devilles, enraged against God, against his eternall and infinite justice, as I began, so I finish, The Lord confound thee, Sathan! The Lord confound you enraged dogges, which so impudently dare barke against the most juste judgements of God! And thus, leaving you to the hands of Him, who sodanely shall revenge his justice from your blasphemies; for the cause of the simple, I say, first, that most maliciously ye accuse us, as that we should affirme God to be slow to mercie and readie to wrath, which blasphemie we protest before God, before his holy angells in heaven, and before his Church here in earth, did never enter into our heart.—John Knox: *Answer to a Great Number of Blasphemous Cavillations written by an Anabaptist and Adversarie to God's Eternall Predestination. Works,* (Laing's ed.,) (vol. vi, pp. 392, 393.)

XI. How Reprobates Ought to Feel.

Since God has appointed the reprobate to eternal death, and has not deemed them worthy of his grace, the question is asked, Are they bound to praise God and to give him thanks that they have been made and created, when it would have been better had they never been made than to have been made for eternal destruction?

Answer: There are two parts to this question: first, whether they are bound to praise God; second, whether they are bound to give him thanks for their creation when they were created for destruction.

As to the first, the following distinction should be made: God is praised either when thanks are given to him, in which

sense the reprobate are [not]* bound to praise him; or when those things are acknowledged to be God's which belong to him, and in this sense they are bound to praise him; that is, they are bound to acknowledge the supreme power of God, which, without impairing his justice, could create them for destruction. Again, they are compelled to acknowledge the justice to God which is exercised toward themselves not without cause but from most weighty reasons. We have an example in Eli. When there came to him a prediction in the name of God that, on account of the wickedness of his sons, himself and his whole family were about to be utterly destroyed, he said, "It is the Lord; let him do what seemeth him good."

In answer to the second question we make this distinction: The reprobate are bound to give thanks to God, first, on account of themselves, second, on account of the elect. For their own sake, because when he could have precipitated them into these or more grievous ills as soon as they were created alien from all good things, he at last did it after conferring many benefits upon them. The reprobate are bound to give thanks to God for the sake of the elect, because he has conferred upon some those benefits which could be given only by him who is infinitely merciful.

We must not neglect, however, the answer of some, who settle the whole matter without reference to remoter questions, to wit: The reprobate are bound to do all these things—namely, to praise God and give him thanks—but the requirement is in order that their wickedness may be aggravated by its transgression. Perhaps, however, some one may urge here, How can one be under such obligations when he has received no benefits? We answer: That Lord whose power over his creatures is supreme has such power that he may require the creature to give him thanks even though no benefit has been conferred. There is a plain instance of this in the reprobate for whom Christ was not sent into the world, and for whom certainly he did not die; yet they are bound to believe all this, and not only this, but also are bound to give thanks to God, as is seen in the first chapter of John, where the world which was made by Christ is upbraided because it did not re-

* This [not] appears to be a misprint, since the contrary position is taken below.

ceive Christ, but rejected him.—MACCOVIUS: *De Reprobatione Quæst.*, ix; *Theol. Polem.*, p. 72.

God has revealed it to be his will to punish some of mankind forever. You know not but you are one of them. Whether you shall be saved or damned depends entirely on his will. And supposing he sees it most for his glory and the general good that you should be damned, it is certainly his will that you should be damned. On this supposition, then, you ought to be willing to be damned, for not to be willing to be damned in this case is opposing God's will.—DR. SAMUEL HOPKINS: *Works*, vol. iii, p. 148.

Perhaps this point may be further illustrated and set in a more convincing light to some by the instance of the angels, who were all created perfectly holy. It was best on the whole, most for God's glory and the general good, that vast numbers of them should rebel and continue in sin and ruin forever; and therefore it was God's will that this should take place. Suppose this had been revealed to them when they were all perfectly holy and each one could not know but he was the person who, among others, was to be given up to sin and destruction for the glory of God and the good of the whole. How ought they to have felt on such an occasion? They must all consent to the will of Jehovah, and say, "Let it take place, how many of us and whoever of us must fall into this sinful, ruined state, or whatever becomes of us." If they did not thus willingly submit to the will of Jehovah they would by that turn enemies to him and fall into that very state and bring that evil upon themselves which they opposed, or to which they refused to submit for the glory of God and the general good.—DR. SAMUEL HOPKINS: *Works*, iii, p. 152.

XII. CONCLUSION.

It is, I confess, a horrible decree.—CALVIN: *Institutio*, iii, xxiii.

Art. V.—THE DANGEROUS CLASSES, AND THEIR TREATMENT.

The Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them. By Charles Loring Brace. New York. 1872.
Half Century with Juvenile Delinquents. By B. K. Peirce, D.D. New York. 1869.
New York and its Institutions. By J. F. Richmond. New York. 1872.
Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York. 1869.

An age producing men of exalted talent, coupled with learning and eloquence, may still be grossly deficient in the sentiments and practices of a true morality. No amount of mere human culture can enable the fallen intellect to fully discover the enormities of moral evil, or prompt the heart to the nice discharge of its highest obligations. Heathen civilization attained its zenith in Greece and Rome, but that age of philosophers, poets, and statesmen was marked by inhumanities unknown to the patriarchal period, and which a Christian population shudders to contemplate. Those cities of wealth and splendor contained slums of moral putrefaction for whose purification no one toiled, and large classes of individuals were perpetually multiplying whose moral renovation was never contemplated. This was eminently true of the hereditary slaves, the captives of war, the gladiators, and of unfortunate children. At precisely what time slavery began it is not now easy to ascertain, but traces of it are found in the earliest historic records. It existed in China thirteen hundred years before Christ, and was common among the ancient Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Carthaginians. The Mosaic regulations concerning the different forms of servitude imposed important limitations on the prerogatives of masters, which always prevailed among the Hebrews, and the slavery of the Hellenic heroic age, and of the earlier Romans, was comparatively mild and generous. Labor was not then considered beneath the dignity of the great. Master and servant toiled in the same field; the Roman patrician, at times, as we learn from the history of Cincinnatus, plowed his own field. But the cupidity engendered by a widening commerce, the increase of luxury, and the rivalries of wealth, coupled with the struggles of the revolting bondman for his liberty, led to the constant tightening of the reins of authority, the lessening of facilities of culture and happiness, until slavery became, in fact,

"the sum of all villainies," engulfing the captive in perpetual darkness and ruin. The early Roman was content with a dozen slaves, or with fifty at the extent; but the later lorded it over twenty thousand with tyrannical exactions previously unknown.

The gladiators originally sprang from the captives, the born slaves, and the condemned criminals. Under the Roman republic, free-born citizens, and under the empire, senators, knights, and even women, entered this demoralized and perilous arena. Their training was brutal to the last degree, leading to the utter extinction of every moral sentiment. Hence the gladiator became the tool of the crafty politician, the source of deep popular demoralization, the scourge and waste of his people. As the manumitted Grecian slave could never become a citizen, so the Roman gladiator, though free-born, could never resume his former rank. This established social and political ostracism led to the most fearful results. Man in any condition is a magazine of power. His resources while ignorant, imbruted, enslaved, and financially poor, are vastly too immense to be overlooked; and, because no system of moral or social renovation was extended to those toiling and sporting millions, they became to their age the "dangerous classes," contributing largely to those revolutions and convulsions which rocked their countries, and culminated finally in the extinction of their institutions and nationalities.

An immense source of supply to these vicious and dangerous classes was found in the multitudes of unfortunate children. Paganism has never evinced any true conception of the value of human life *per se*, nor of the inalienable rights of the human soul. Persons not likely to be supporters at home or of service to the State have been considered of no account, and have found little favor. It is also chilling to mark the icy deftness with which the Roman parent could dissolve his relation with his child. Infanticide, particularly the destruction of deformed children and the female children of the poor, prevailed extensively, and was approved by men as distinguished as Plato and Aristotle. Children were coolly sold into slavery by their own parents through motives of gain, and by homeless and thriftless parents to save them from starvation in periods of financial distress. They were also sold by the authorities for debt due the imperial treasury. A more common practice, however,

was the exposure or abandonment of children who were crippled, or were from any cause a disagreeable incumbrance to their parents. "Crowds of these little unfortunates were to be seen exposed around a column near the Velabrum at Rome," to be carried away at will by ruthless hands, some to become slaves, some prostitutes; some to be the traveling companions of gypsies and beggars, whose features, joints, or spine they had wickedly distorted, that their public exhibition might draw from the multitudes larger charities; and others were strangled by magicians and witches, their bodies being employed in their incantations.

This is the picture which the most enlightened and polished States, outside of Judea, presented at the dawn of Christianity. As the deepest shade may exist in the rear of the cathedral whose front and spire are bathed in the brightest light, so an age of reputed statesmanship, of conquest, chivalry, or of philosophic study, may spread its dark shadow over neglected or ill-taught millions who are so gnawing at the foundations of society as to threaten the engulfment of all. The ameliorating influences which came in the later centuries of Roman history—the founding of a few institutions for the poor and helpless, and the tardy legislation for the punishment of inhuman parents—were the outgrowth of that measure of Christianity introduced into the kingdom. Mr. Brace has then truly said, "Christ leads the reform of the world as well as its charity."

But the principles of Christianity have been nowhere so thoroughly applied as to utterly exhaust the "dangerous classes." They collect and rapidly multiply in all great centers of population. Mr. Brace's book on "The Dangerous Classes of New York" is probably the most important volume on the cause and cure of juvenile crime ever issued from the American press. The author graduated at Yale College in 1847, and subsequently entered the Union Theological Seminary of New York, where he completed his preparatory course for the ministry. Here he offered his services on the Sabbath to Rev. Mr. Pease, then laboring among the wretched at the Five Points, and to the penal and charitable institutions established by the city on the islands of the East River. Having completed his theological course, he crossed the Atlantic and traveled on foot over a large part of Europe, making special

study of the vagrant and criminal classes, and of the institutions established for their correction and improvement. Returning to New York, he engaged for a time in somewhat desultory toil for the criminal and abandoned classes, until the founding of the "Children's Aid Society," in 1853, when he became, and has for twenty years remained, the indefatigable secretary and master-spirit of the organization. Gifted with a vivacious and sympathetic nature, shrewd discernment of character, unusual skill in organization and government, he has so ingeniously linked himself between the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the benevolent and the needy, as to wield a powerful influence in promoting the equilibrium of society. His toils have been lightened and strengthened by many high-minded men of wealth, representing the different Protestant denominations, and by intelligent, queenly women not a few, who have brought their noblest offerings to insure the success of the undertaking. His position has afforded wide opportunity for the study of that portion of our population which furnishes the mass of our criminals. His work is a compact duodecimo of four hundred and forty-eight pages, divided into thirty-seven chapters, and treats concisely of the duties of society to the foundling, the street waif, the youthful criminal, the prostitute, and the pauper. He discusses the methods for organizing charities, treats of State aid to charities, and gives a graphic history of the workings of his own society since its organization. The volume, printed on tinted paper, is embellished with thirteen original engravings, illustrating the career of the street waif and the methods employed for his rescue. The tone of the work is always earnest, and in style is clear and chaste. We cannot review all its topics, or indeed glance at them, in the limits of a brief article, and our heading has already intimated that we did not propose to confine ourselves strictly to a review of his volume.

It is a noteworthy fact, gleaned from many carefully-collected statistics, that the vast majority of our paupers and criminals of all ages and grades, which impose the chief burdens on society and form the "dangerous classes," are of foreign birth, or, if American-born, are of foreign extraction. Of fifteen hundred and sixty-three prisoners committed to the New York Penitentiary in 1869, eight hundred and thirty-three of them were

foreign-born, over three fourths of them came from Ireland and Germany, and a large percentage of those born in America were of foreign parentage. Of the twenty thousand sent annually to the workhouse on Blackwell's Island, but few are of genuine American blood. Of the forty-nine thousand four hundred and twenty-three incarcerated in the New York city prisons during 1869, thirty-two thousand two hundred and twenty-five, or nearly four fifths, were of foreign birth, and most of the remainder were the progeny of families reared in those distant countries. It has been ascertained that of the prisoners at Auburn from one third to one half are foreigners; at Clinton fully one half are such; at Sing Sing about three fourths; and of all detained in the Albany Penitentiary for the twenty years past, nearly two thirds were foreigners. The same relative proportion is found in the New York Almshouse, in Bellevue Hospital, and in all the juvenile reformatories scattered over the islands.

Though Ireland contributes only about two thirds as many immigrants to our shores as Germany, yet her sons are justly charged with two thirds of the crime committed by the representatives of these two nationalities. The English and the Scotch immigrants less frequently descend to criminal practices here, yet we are told that at "home the Irish are one of the most law-abiding and virtuous of populations—the proportion of criminals being smaller than in England or Scotland." The English, the Scotch, and the German know more of liberty, of genuine self-restraint, and of popular government in their own countries than the Irish. Hence, when the latter bids adieu to the rigors, both of Church and State, under which he has long been bound, and enters our far-famed land of freedom, the immense reaction in his inflammatory nature too generally interprets liberty to signify *depraved license*, which mistaken theory so early hurries him to a hospital or a prison.

Emigration, also, is unfavorable, as a whole, to improved morals. Unhappy illustrations of this fact are found among the citizens of all countries. Our author well says: "The emigrant is released from the social inspection and judgment to which he has been subjected at home, and the tie of the Church and priesthood is weakened. If a Roman Catholic, he is often a worse Catholic without being a better Protestant. If

a Protestant, he often becomes indifferent. Moral ties are loosened with the religious. The intervening process which occurs here, between his abandoning the old state of things and fitting himself to the new, is not favorable to morals or character."

The Irish peasantry at home are generally faithful to the marriage relation. The Romish Church has given little license for divorce among the laboring classes, and many Irishmen who never would have thought of dissolving their domestic relations in their native land, yield from trivial causes to such temptations here because dwelling in the obscurities of an American city, far removed from early associations. Second marriage and "practical tests of the free-love doctrine" Mr. Brace pronounces fruitful sources of juvenile crime. So few children among the poor glide on happily under the control of a step-parent, and so few of such parents possess the love, self-sacrifice, and tact necessary to bear with and suitably train children not their own, that it is the commonest thing, when questioning a vagrant boy or a street-wandering girl as to their former home, to be told: "I could not get on with my step-mother;" or, "My step-father treated me badly;" or, "My father left, and we just took care of ourselves."

When the husband and father, weary of the burdens of a large family, soured by domestic infelicities, or drawn away by treacherous love for one less faded and infirm, under pretense of seeking employment abroad, disappears, his disconsolate wife with unfaltering affection searches for him far and near, spending her last dollar, perhaps her furniture, after which she begins the cheerless struggle for the maintenance of her household. Her children she is compelled to neglect. Entering with her into the struggle for subsistence, they must run errands, peddle, beg, glean the docks for fuel, learn all the coarse morals of the streets, and when half grown abandon their dismal home and careworn mother, the boys for treachery and imprisonment, and the girls for a life of shame.

Another source of juvenile crime is orphanage. Of seven thousand nine hundred and sixty-three inmates of reformatories in our country in 1870, fifty-five per cent. were orphans or half orphans; and of four hundred and fifty-two youthful criminals sent to the New York House of Refuge during the same year, nearly sixty per cent. had lost one or both parents. Of the

three thousand five hundred and eighty youthful inmates received into the Mettria, the celebrated French reformatory, one thousand five hundred and forty-two were without father or mother. Mr. Brace quotes Morsangy, a French writer, who declares that "a fifth of those" in France "who have been the objects of judicial pursuit are composed of orphans, the half having no father, and a quarter no mother." These statistics corroborate the statement made by the "Prison Association of New York" in their report of 1869. In searching for the causes of crime, they pronounced "want of due parental care and government" the most "prolific" of all. They declared that after "careful study of statistics, and personal conversation with thousands of criminals," they were assured that, "back of all other causes, underlying all, and giving potency to all, is this lack of early domestic restraint and discipline."

Next to this, the Prison Association pronounced "drink" "the most potent approximate cause of crime." That the use of intoxicating drinks is productive of much crime, is proven by the facts that nine tenths of all criminals have been addicted to their use, and that ninety out of every hundred of the children in the industrial schools came from homes of dissipation. Mr. Brace's chapter on this topic is thoughtful, though somewhat contradictory in statements, and, as we think, in some respects contrary to facts, while his theory for the removal of intemperance will not be generally accepted by temperance men. He declares that the appetite for alcoholic stimulants is not common in childhood; that the "laboring man especially" feels its power; that "the passion for alcohol is a real one, and on a broad scale cannot be annihilated." He lauds the "Total Abstinence" effort, but says it has about spent its power; that "abstinence is not thoroughly natural, and has no chance of universal acceptance." To us it is clear, from many examples, that where both parents are habitually intemperate the children universally inherit the appetite, or that peculiarity of constitution which engenders it, though poverty may keep them from excessive drinking during their minority, and favoring outside influences save them from drunkenness afterward. If in the statement that "the passion for alcohol is a real one, and on a broad scale cannot be annihilated," he means that this "passion" is a *necessary* or a *universal* one he is confront-

ed by the facts that the aborigines of many countries lived long and healthfully without alcohol, and as far as we know never wanted it until a false appetite was fostered; and that thousands in countries where these stimulants abound have toiled long and excessively without ever feeling the risings of this "passion." He justly remarks that intemperance will be diminished by elevating the tastes of the laboring classes; that the Kensington Museum and Sydenham Palace, of London, the Cooper Union, the Reading-rooms, and the Central Park, of New York, by affording rational recreation and facilities for improvement, will greatly aid in this direction. But that the "noble asceticism" of "total abstinence" has about spent its "power" in the world sounds too much like the old infidel boast that "Christianity" "was in its twilight." We can see, also, nothing but utter folly in his theory for the removal of the evils of intemperance by "introducing into those countries where heavy drinking prevails the taste for light wines." As long as the knowledge and facilities for the manufacture of the "heavy" drinks remain—and men are never known to abandon this vice by "gradual steps," but by indulgence to universally go from bad to worse—the only safe and effectual prevention is abstinence; and to educate the public conscience up to this standard, however long and discouraging the process, is the only method by which we can rid the world of two thirds of its poverty and crime.

In estimating the sources of crime, Mr. Brace lays particular emphasis on "Transmitted Tendencies." His treatment of this topic is more than ordinarily interesting and curious, and we cannot resist the temptation to introduce some of his thoughts on the subject. On page 42 he says: "A most powerful and continual source of crime with the young is Inheritance—the transmitted tendencies and qualities of their parents, or of several generations of ancestors. It is well known to those familiar with the criminal classes that certain appetites or habits, if indulged abnormally and excessively through two or more generations, come to have an almost irresistible force, and, no doubt, modify the brain so as to constitute almost an insane condition. This is especially true of the appetite for liquor and of the sexual passions, and sometimes of the peculiar weakness, dependence, and laziness which make

confirmed paupers. The writer knows of an instance in Western New York where four generations of females were paupers and prostitutes. Almost every reader who is familiar with village life will recall poor families which have had dissolute or criminal members beyond the memory of the oldest inhabitants, and who still continue to breed such characters. I have known a child of nine or ten years given up, apparently beyond control, to licentious habits and desires, and who in all different circumstances seemed to show the same tendencies; her mother had been of similar character, and quite likely her grandmother. The gemmules, or latent tendencies, or forces, or cells of her immediate ancestors, were in her system, and working in her blood, producing irresistible effects on her brain, nerves, and mental emotions, and finally, not being met early enough by other moral, mental, and physical influences, they have modified her organization until her will is scarcely able to control them, and she gives herself up to them. All those who instruct or govern 'Houses of Refuge,' or 'Reform Schools,' or 'Asylums' for criminal children and youth, will recall many instances. They are much better known in the Old World than in this; they are far more common here in the country than in the city."

A sudden turn in his reasoning, which half nullifies his argument, here save him from abandoning these degraded classes to inevitable depravity, which a moment before seemed the only thing possible. He introduces the Darwinian theory of "Natural Selection," and attempts a philosophic explanation of the processes of inward reformation. He says: "My own experience during twenty years has been in this regard singularly hopeful. I have watched great numbers of degraded families in New York, and exceedingly few of them have transmitted new generations of paupers, criminals, or vagrants. The causes of this encouraging state of things are not obscure. The action of the great law of 'natural selection' in regard to the human race is always toward temperance and virtue. That is, vice and extreme indulgence weaken the physical powers and undermine the constitution; they impair the faculties by which man struggles with adverse conditions and gets beyond the reach of poverty and want. The vicious and sensual and drunkard die earlier, or they have fewer children, or their

children are carried off by diseases more frequently, or they themselves are unable to resist or prevent poverty or suffering. As a consequence in the lowest class, the more self-controlled and virtuous tend constantly to survive, and to prevail in the struggle for existence over the vicious and ungoverned, and to transmit their progeny. The natural drift among the poor is toward virtue. Probably no vicious organization with very extreme abnormal tendencies is transmitted beyond the fourth generation ; it ends in insanity, or cretinism, or the wildest crime. The result is, then, with the worst endowed families, that the gemmules, or latent forces, of hundreds of virtuous, or, at least, not vicious, generations lie hid in their constitutions. The immediate influence of parents or grandparents are, of course, the strongest in inheritance ; but these may be overcome, and the latent tendencies to good, coming down from remote ancestors, be aroused and developed. Thus is explained the extraordinary improvement of the children of crime and poverty in our industrial schools, and the reforms and happy changes seen in the boys and girls of our dangerous classes when placed in kind Western homes. The change of circumstances, the improved food, the daily moral and mental influences, the effect of regular labor and discipline, and above all, the power of religion, awaken these hidden tendencies to good, both those coming from many generations of comparative virtue, and those inherent in the soul, while they control and weaken, and cause to be forgotten, those diseased appetites or extreme passions which these unfortunate creatures inherit directly, and substitute a higher moral sense for the low instincts which they obtained from their parents." His argument is that these degenerate types of character are more generally perpetuated in the monotony of rural life where families dwell for generations in the same hut with slight admixtures of blood ; while the system of change, rife in all cities, of families from house to house, the transition of neighborhoods and the separation of members of the same family, introduce variety, and prevent that complete transmission of concentrated vice.

Ignorance is generally, though not always, an accompaniment of vice. Some great counterfeiters, thieves, burglars, and smugglers are even educated geniuses ; and whole families of professional criminals live under assumed names and titles

in respectable circles, educating their children to their own practices, and marrying them to persons of similar breeding. Knowledge, however, both of books and of business, tends usually toward useful occupation and virtue. In the State of New York but two and seven tenths per cent. of the general population are unable to read; but of its criminals thirty-one per cent. do not possess that ability. It has also been ascertained that of the prisoners of the whole United States more than four fifths never learned trades. Thriftlessness on the part of poor parents in cities, and the depravity of trade "unions" in refusing to employ boys and discouraging the training of apprentices, throws thousands of poor children into the wild scramble of the streets, to be viciously educated for every evil.

We mention one more source of crime from which the "dangerous classes" are recruited in New York, and that is, the enormous overcrowding of the population. New York island is small and narrow, the lower portion being largely covered with business houses and manufactories, leaving little space for residences; yet the laboring classes think they must live on the island and as near as possible to their employment. Capitalists in attempting to provide for these emergencies have introduced the greatest evils. On the less eligible and most malarious sections they have reared blocks of high, cheap brick houses, often a row of rear dwellings on the same tier of lots, all poorly lighted and ventilated, and with no yards. These are divided into small apartments for families, where the poor and unfortunate huddle together to grow daily poorer and more vile. Occasionally a large double house, called a "barrack," contains a thousand or fifteen hundred persons, all of whom are covered with vermin and bleared with vice. Miserable herds of unsightly humanity dwell in cellars too damp and filthy for brutes, surviving for years without a stove, table, or bed, and are often driven by the inundations from the rivers from their gloomy caverns to sleep on the pavements. In no city in the world are human beings so closely packed as in New York. The highest rate in East London is 175,816 to the square mile; but the Eleventh Ward of New York had, in 1866, 196,510 to the same space, an addition of nearly 20,000. The Strand of London has an average of six persons more to the acre than the Eleventh Ward of

New York; but the fashionable portions of New York contain an average of twenty-six more to the acre than corresponding sections of London. In 1865 a plot of less than thirty acres in the Fourth Ward contained 17,611 persons, or a rate equal to 290,000 to the square mile. The high price of land, the cupidity of capitalists, and the evils of bad government, have united to increase rents to a fearful pitch. The result is that families occupy but a single floor, and in multitudes of instances several families live in a single room. A visitor of the Children's Aid Society reported that in the First Ward in one dark cellar, filled with smoke, there slept in one room, with no partition dividing them, two men with their wives, a girl of fourteen years, two men and a large boy of seventeen, a mother with two more boys, one ten and one fifteen, another woman with two boys of nine and eleven years respectively—in all fourteen persons. This ordinary circle was often increased during the night by hospitality extended to vicious comrades, vagrants, and dissipated vagabonds. Here children are born and reared. If the proprieties of life are ever known they are soon outraged and forgotten. Indeed, in many families they are never known until reached by some mission influence. Young women are found in these squalid neighborhoods who have never seen the better portions of the city, never entered a school-room or a church, never seen a Bible or heard a prayer. Half-naked boys have been found peddling in the streets who knew nothing of their nativity, their relatives, and some did not even know their own names.

Without this inhuman crowding New York would be the healthiest city in the world, and one of the most virtuous. The annual death-rate of London is about 24 per 1,000, and in Liverpool it has been as high as 40, while in New York at present it stands at about 28. Some of our well-kept wards only reach about 15 per 1,000, (equal to the Isle of Wight,) while in some crowded, filthy localities it reaches nearly 200 per 1,000. It has been ascertained that the occupants of the 19,000 tenant-houses (about half the population of the city) yield over 73 per cent. of the mortality. There are "barracks" where fever and cholera hold a perpetual carnival, and cannot be expelled by police or sanitary authorities. But the moral aspects of these sin-darkened regions are vastly more appall-

ing. Shut away from school and church, with no Bible, no Sabbath, no restraint but their enemies, and no God but their passions, they tend naturally to the development of every brutal and fiendish propensity. Criminal statistics always keep pace with physical degradation. Astonishing moral revolutions have taken place in the vilest quarters of New York during the last twenty-five years, yet there are still "Murderers' Alleys" and "Dens of Thieves" where every sentiment of decency is hourly outraged, where every floor is polluted with unnatural vices and crimsoned with human gore. In these dens of filth and foul speech grow up the little bootblacks, newsboys, vagrants, pilferers, and sneak thieves who at a later period become the drunkards, garroters, gamblers, burglars, and rioters. Here, too, are the girls who pick rags, sweep muddy streets, and sell chestnuts to-day, but who will fill the low groggeries and dance-houses to-morrow, and the cells of the Tombs and the granite structures of Blackwell's Island a little later.

From fifteen thousand to forty thousand homeless and vagrant youth of both sexes are always flitting through the lanes and streets of New York, the number being much the largest in winter on account of the suspension of many branches of industry, and the thousands of recruits who find employment in summer around the bays and along the canals. These sell the daily papers, run errands, clean pavements, beg and pilfer during the day, and sleep in old boxes, cellars, deserted buildings, under carts, or in hallways, during the night. Thrown early upon their own resources, and uncared for by a calculating world, they become prematurely skillful in business and crime. Spending their winters amid the blaze of the metropolis, adorned with churches, schools, and all the embellishments of art, where business, culture, benevolence, and virtue attain their grandest prominence, they are still as completely unreached by moral appliances as the little Arabs of the desert, while their perpetual drill in the multiplied practices of the vile insure to society a race of criminals which the ordinary penal institutions only perpetuate and intensify.

The American criminal is also the most deliberate and desperate in the world. Mr. Brace on page 27 says: "The intensity of the American temperament is felt in every fiber of

these children of poverty and vice. Their crimes have the unrestrained and sanguinary character of a race accustomed to overcome all obstacles. They rifle a bank where English thieves would pick a pocket; they murder where European *proletaires* cudgel or fight with fists; in a riot they begin what seems to be the sacking of a city where English rioters would merely batter policemen or smash lamps. The murder of an old man like Mr. Rogers is nothing to them. They are ready for any offense or crime however degraded or bloody."

But it is vastly easier to study the causes and tendencies of crime than to suggest and apply an effectual remedy. All the sentiments of humanity revolt, however, against the unfeeling abandonment of criminals of any age or grade to the utter consequences of their crimes, incarcerating them in prisons where heartlessness, profanity, and unmitigated rigors hold absolute sway. The toils of Howard, Lord Brougham, Elizabeth Fry, of the Gurneys and Buxtons of England, and of Colden, Griscom, Eddy, Gerard, Clinton, and Livingston, and many others in America, have utterly failed in securing any satisfactory moral discipline and treatment in the prisons for mature criminals in their respective countries. There should ever be a threefold object in imprisonment: 1. To separate the culprit from society, whose security he has endangered and whose confidence he has forfeited; 2. To make him sensible of the law he has violated; and, 3. To secure, if possible, his reformation and return to the useful walks of life. The first two are tolerably well secured in all countries, but the last and most important of all is rarely attained, and far too seldom attempted. In our country the incessant changes in management and of unfortunate preferments, occasioned by the surgings of political parties, are believed by those who have given the subject the deepest attention to be the chief "bane and blight of our prison system."

Dr. Bates, six years an inspector of prisons in the State of New York, testified in 1868 before the "Prison Association of New York" as follows: "I think there are some reformations in prisons, but the number is small. Very many, especially the younger prisoners, go out worse than they came in." Mr. Augsbury, an ex-warden of Auburn, said: "As reformatories our prisons are a failure. Men are there educated in

crime." A contractor long connected with Clinton prison testified: "The reformation of the convicts does not appear to enter into the thoughts of the authorities." Sworn testimony to the same effect was obtained from the physician, principal keeper, clerk, and teacher at Auburn, the chaplain and keeper at Clinton, and from the chaplain and chief keeper at Sing Sing. Officers are not chosen generally on account of their moral qualities or established fitness for so important a calling, but from their standing or services in a political party. This is more than a mistake; it is a cruelty to the criminals and to society at large. Every possible incentive to reformation should be held out to the mature criminal, and every influence introduced likely to excite the desire of amendment, or to bring up from the depths of his fallen nature the return of buried manhood. This reprehensible disregard of moral appliances for the recovery of prisoners on the part of the authorities appears in the county jails as much as in the State prisons. The statute provides that there shall be a Bible in every cell. In a few jails this is complied with, though in most it is not, and many contain not a book of any kind. In only two or three counties is a regular chaplain employed; and of the quarter of a million annually expended in the support of the sixty-eight jails in New York, we are told "not five hundred dollars are employed with any view of meeting the religious wants of the prisoners." Crime cannot go unpunished without increasing the evil, and the association of the virtuous with the vile has the same tendency. About fifty years ago a lad of fourteen years belonging to a wealthy family in New York city was brought into court "for the theft of a canary bird." The case was prosecuted by the district attorney before Mayor Colden as judge, and the lad was defended by James W. Gerard. The counsel for the defense, admitting the allegation charged against his client, still insisted that as there was no separate prison for boys his incarceration among expert criminals would ultimate in his perfect depravity. His plea was so adroitly and feelingly presented that the jury refused to find the lad guilty and he was discharged. Emboldened by his escape, he soon after committed a more grave offense and went to prison, where he was thoroughly schooled in vice, and at last died in prison, receiving while suffering under his last commitment the legacy of his family,

amounting to eighty thousand dollars. Correction in a suitable institution at the beginning of his ill-planned career would probably have saved him. But no such institution had yet been founded in New York. Early in the present century Sir T. F. Buxton of England, issued a work entitled "An Inquiry whether Crime and Misery are Produced or Prevented by the Present System of Prison Discipline in England," and among other things narrates the following: "When I first went to Newgate my attention was directed by my companion to a boy whose apparent innocence and artlessness had attracted his notice. The school-master said he was an example to all the rest; so quiet, so reserved, and so unwilling to have any intercourse with his dissolute companions. At his trial he was acquitted upon evidence which did not leave a shadow of suspicion upon him; but I lately recognized him again in Newgate, but with a very different character. He confessed to me that, on his release, he had associated with the acquaintances formed in prison. Of his ruin I can feel but little doubt, and as little as to the cause of it. He came to Newgate innocent; he left it corrupted." The same principle was illustrated in the career of the late Edward H. Ruloff, carrying down in the dark tide of his felony to a watery grave at Binghamton the once amiable son of his former prison-keeper.

During 1869, as we have said, there were 1,563 prisoners committed to the New York Penitentiary, of whom 276 were between the ages of fifteen and twenty years; 427 between twenty and twenty-five; 316 between twenty-five and thirty, after which the number rapidly decreased with each semi-decade. But twenty of those committed were under fifteen years of age, ten of whom were girls. Similar statistics, obtained from other sources, establish the astounding fact that nearly half of all entering our penitentiaries are under twenty-five years of age, and appeal anxiously for the adoption of measures for the moral arrest of these "cadets of crime ere they are irrevocably enrolled in the ranks of that army whose march terminates at the State-prisons or on the gallows."

Howard and his philanthropic successors have not completed the disciplinary reform in the large prisons of either Continent, yet the seven hundred and fifty juvenile reformatories of Europe, with their fifty thousand vagrant, orphaned,

or vicious inmates, and scores of refuges, juvenile asylums, and reform-schools, taking youthful delinquents from the magistrates to educate and discipline for virtuous industry, diffused throughout our own land, testify that they have not labored in vain. Among the oldest and noblest in theory and fruit stands the "Refuge" on Randall's Island, organized in 1825. Among its Managers have ranked many of the wisest men of the State, who have grappled intelligently with every phase of the undertaking involved in the reformation of juvenile delinquents.

In 1863 the "Roman Catholic Protectory," now located at West Farms, N. Y., was incorporated to keep the criminals of that faith from Protestant institutions. It has vast accommodations for delinquent youth of both sexes, and is always filled.

Nearly all admitted into these two institutions are criminals under sixteen years of age at the time of commitment. It is the purpose of the institutions to educate them in common English, correct their morals, and teach them trades, after which they are returned to society. In 1851, in answer to a wide-spread desire, the "New York Juvenile Asylum" was incorporated, to assist in relieving the city from its armies of ill-trained, untrained, and vagrant children. Those coming under the care of this society are between the ages of five and fourteen years, and may be divided into two general classes: First, the truant and disobedient; secondly, the friendless and neglected. The first are voluntarily surrendered by their parents for discipline, or committed by the magistrates for reformation. The second class, found in a state of friendlessness and want, or abandonment or vagrancy, may be committed by the Mayor, Recorder, any Alderman or Magistrate. At the commitment of a child notice is served on his parents, and if satisfactory securities for the training of the child be given within twenty days it is discharged; if not, it becomes the ward of the Asylum, to be indentured by its Managers to a suitable person. Many thousands of these children have been returned to their parents, and about four thousand indentured in the State of Illinois. The workings of this asylum are highly creditable to its founders and patrons, who have contributed vast sums for its support.

As early as 1812 Rev. Mr. Stanford, chaplain of the penal institutions of New York, recommended that the advanced criminals be separated from the youthful, and that those boys

inclined to adventure be trained in a nautical ship for service on the sea. But the car of progress often runs slowly, so the authorities of New York waited over half a century, and allowed England and Massachusetts to successfully inaugurate the scheme originated by one of her own citizens. In 1869, however, this long-desired project was inaugurated by the purchase of the sail-ship Mercury, a packet of 1,200 tons, which was fitted for service, and made capable of accommodating about three hundred boys. The vessel is under the control of the "Commissioners of Charities and Corrections," and the wild and adventurous youth falling into the municipal institutions are transferred to the school-ship, where a year or two of good drilling fits them to enter the merchant marine, or serve in the United States Navy. Many hundreds have already been discharged from the vessel, not a few of whom have shipped on the regular lines of commerce, proving conclusively that this is a laudable method for relieving society from the "dangerous classes," and of affording means of usefulness to those who cannot be sobered to the quietudes of ordinary industry. All the correctional and charitable institutions of New York, save those controlled by the "Commissioners of Charities and Corrections," have been founded and are controlled by private corporations, receiving more or less assistance from the State or city authorities. The Government is bound to relieve society from these juvenile armies of vicious vagrants, but it has wisely preferred to hand them over to institutions directed by private corporations. Such institutions, to obtain support, must submit to rigid inspections, being every year thrown anew upon their merits, and judged by their fruits.

Mr. Brace and his associates were by no means the first to discover that "prevention is better than cure," and that the "dangerous classes" were to be reached and reformed in childhood. All distinguished philanthropists, from Francke down to our day, have labored to develop this sentiment. For this every "*Rauhe Haus*," "Farm School," and "Refuge" has been reared. Nevertheless, the organization of the "Children's Aid Society," in 1853, was the nucleus of an enterprise for reaching at an earlier period, and more effectually, the masses of neglected children than any hitherto adopted in any country. The "Orphan Asylum" societies had done an excellent work in their

modest way; but their plan of retaining children a term of years soon filled their buildings and exhausted their income. The old "New York Orphan Asylum" was organized in 1807, but during its first thirty years it relieved less than one thousand children. The "Half-Orphan Asylum," begun in 1836, has been one of our best charities, yet during thirty-six years it has relieved less than four thousand. The "Leake and Watts Orphan House" has now an invested capital of about two millions, yet provides annually for but one hundred and twenty-five children, and has relieved only about one thousand since its opening in 1843. The "Children's Aid Society," repudiating all asylum theories, has sent to homes in the country in less than twenty years more than twenty-five thousand persons, probably more than have been reached by all the orphan societies of New York during this century. The "Five Points Mission," established in 1850, was the pioneer of its kind, breasting the darkest tide of iniquity in its deepest abyss. It has educated and reformed multitudes, and sent thousands to situations, as have also the "House of Industry," and the "Howard Mission." The "Home of the Friendless" was the first radical divergence from the old orphan-house system, introducing the plan of sending children to good country homes, and paving the way for the wider influence of the "Children's Aid Society."

Mr. Brace and his associates early established a system of "Lodging Houses" for the wild, homeless little Arabs of the streets, and, to promote their self-respect, compelled them to pay six cents for a lodging, four cents for supper, with a bath thrown in. The establishment of order, with any notion of correct morals, and the forms of religion among these children, required the greatest skillfulness. More than once they broke the windows, smashed the lamps, and pelted their benefactors with eggs and brickbats. Christian perseverance, however, always triumphed, and by artful processes were introduced the savings-bank, the evening school, and the religious service, a request for each being first artfully drawn out in a popular vote, after which they were never allowed to recant. Eight or ten thousand different boys are temporarily domiciled for a season each year in the ample buildings the Society has now purchased and furnished. Of the one hundred thousand of this class who

have thus shared in the provisions of the Society, it has been difficult to tell whence they came and whither many of them have tended. Many have been raised to usefulness, and the newsboys as a class greatly improved, though a new crop appears each year, affording no cessation in the toils of the Society.

Twenty "Industrial Schools" for girls, too poor, ragged, and dissolute to be admitted into the Ward schools, have been established, the first under the direction of Mrs. Wilson. These have been wisely located in the vilest neighborhoods to reach the dregs of society, among the German rag-pickers, the Irish swill-gatherers, the Italian organ-grinders, the dens of the Five Points, the filthy sinks of the East River, and the squatter villages further up town. Besides the Industrial Schools of this Association many others have been established by other societies, the "Home of the Friendless" sustaining at least eleven. These, with the influence exerted by the numerous missions and the societies toiling for the recovery of fallen women, have accomplished a most estimable work, decreasing crime among women and girls beyond all precedent. In 1860 the police arrested 5,880 female vagrants; but in 1871, though the population had increased about 150,000, there were but 548 similarly arrested, a decrease of more than nine tenths.

A child otherwise certain to become a criminal is reached, trained in useful knowledge and virtue at an annual expense of from fifteen dollars in the "Industrial School" to fifty in the "Lodging House," and such as choose to go are transported to homes in the West at an expense to the Society of fifteen dollars. A lesson of true economy is taught in the history of three brothers who entered the "Newsboys' Lodging House." The two younger were sent by this Society to homes in the West at a cost of thirty dollars, and are now useful citizens. The other became a criminal, and has already cost the community thousands. It costs less to suitably educate the "dangerous classes" than to punish them. The arrest and trial of Real cost sixteen thousand dollars; that of Van Echten twenty thousand; and the trial and execution of Buckhout cost the County of Westchester forty thousand dollars. Prevention is cheaper than cure, leaving out of view the most appalling thought of all—the moral wreck of the unhappy criminals.

Art. VI. — SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews:

Christian Quarterly, April, 1873. (Cincinnati.)—1. Ecclesiastical Polity in the First Age. 2. Paul's Schism. 3. The Basis of Christian Union. 4. Wüttke on the Irrationality of Sin. 5. Church Organization *versus* Church Government. 6. Christianity on the Planet Mars. 7. The Victory of Faith. 8. Letter, Spirit, Law, Gospel, Written Letter. 9. The Atonement.

Mercersburg Review, April, 1873. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Roman Question. 2. First Dogmatic Decree on the Church of Christ published in the Fourth Session of the Holy Œcumenical Council of the Vatican. 3. Döllinger's Reply to the Archbishop of Munich. 4. The German Bishops as Witnesses of the Truth. 5. The Old Catholic Movement. 6. Does a Divine Curse Rest Upon the World? 7. The Tendency of Individualism in the German Churches in America. 8. Theological Science in America.

New Englander, April, 1873. (New Haven.)—1. The Religious Element of Education and the Public School System. 2. Moral Intuition *versus* Utilitarianism. 3. The Gospel in Bible Lands. 4. The Treaty of Washington in 1871. 5. On the Law of Mortality that has Prevailed among the Former Members of the Divinity School of Yale College. 6. The Religious Character of Faraday. 7. Auguste Comte and Positivism.

New England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal, April, 1873. (Boston.)—1. Memoir of Col. Joseph May. 2. Officers in the Battle of Breed's or Bunker Hill. 3. Harvard College—Public Exhibition, 1795. 4. Brief Memoirs and Notices of Prince's Subscribers. 5. William Claiborne. 6. Genealogical Notes and Errata. 7. Record-Book of the First Church in Charlestown. 8. Gleanings. 9. Will of Francis Champernoun. 10. John Baldwin of Stonington, and other Baldwins. 11. Expedition to Cape Breton—Journal of the Rev. Adonijah Bidwell. 12. Manasseh Cutler—The Man who Purchased Ohio. 13. Records of the Presbyterian Church, Westerly, R. I. 14. The Flanders Family. 15. Descendants of William Lane. 16. Address by the Hon. Marshall P. Wilder.

North American Review, April, 1873. (Boston.)—1. The New German School of Music. 2. Evolution of Self-Consciousness. 3. Theophile Gautier. 4. The Indian Question. 5. Herder.

Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review, April, 1873. (New York.)—1. The Three Ideas. 2. Crimes of Passion and Crimes of Reflection. 3. The Immediate Cause of the Death of Christ. 4. Dr. Dorner's System of Theology. 5. The Persian Cuneiform Inscription the Key to the Assyrian. 6. An Obituary of Dr. Liebner by Dr. Dörner. 7. The Remnants of the Ten Tribes. 8. Tulloch's Theology. 9. Hamilton's Autology. 10. Notice of Dr. Burns by Dr. M'Cosh.

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, April, 1873. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Conversion of the World to Christ. 2. William Penn, the Founder of Pennsylvania. 3. Close Communion. 4. The German Language in the Educational Institutions of the Lutheran Church in the United States. 5. Religious Faith of Wordsworth and Tennyson as Shown in their Poems. 6. The Intermediate State. 7. Exegetical. Titus ii, 13.

Theological Medium, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, April, 1873. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Motion. 2. The Importance of our Colleges to the Church. 3. A Practical Exposition of Zechariah vi, 12, 13. 4. On the Mode of Baptism. 5. The Preparation of Sermons for the Pulpit. 6. Creation. 7. Christian Philosophy. 8. The Function of Prayer in the Economy of the Universe. 9. The Scriptural Doctrine of the Triumph of Christ's Kingdom Distinguished from Millenarianism.

American Church Review, January, 1873. (The Church Press, Hartford, Conn.)—1. Thomas Aquinas. 2. The Seventeenth Article. 3. John Skelton. 4. Local Deacons. 5. The Spiritual Essence of Christianity. 6. Conflicts of Church and State. 7. How to Treat Modern Skepticism. 8. Presbyterianism and Episcopacy in Scotland. 9. Protestantism in Germany.

April, 1873.—1. The Seventeenth Article. 2. The Controversy About Prayer. 3. The "Dies Iræ." 4. The Spiritual Essence of Christianity. 5. Lossing's Life of General Schuyler. 6. Presbyterianism and Episcopacy in Scotland. 7. The First Bishop of Vermont. 8. William of Ockham, the Prereformer.

The "American Church Review" is distinguished among our religious Quarterlies, as might be expected, by ability, graceful scholarship, a fine historic spirit, and an elegant external finish. We were particularly attracted by the two articles in these two numbers on "The Seventeenth Article," and with their survey of the share of Calvinism in the English Reformation, taken in comparison with Professor Fisher's account in his valuable History. The two views seriously vary, and those interested in this topic are happily able to check the historian by the reviewer. The two Articles can, we believe, be obtained separate from the Review.

The Seventeenth of the Thirty-Nine Articles, as our readers know, is charged to be Calvinistic. Wesley omitted it from the Twenty-Five which we have accepted as our standards. He did not thereby affirm it to be Calvinistic. Both he and we could doubtless have signed it, and the rest, as "Articles of Agreement," and yet would prefer to omit it in forming a new compact. How far it is necessarily or easily Calvinistic, and how far the English Church was and is Calvinistic, may fairly come up in its turn as a question of historic and theological interest. The conclusion to which it brings us is eminently honorable to the Christian moderation and tolerance of the English reformers. They meant, if we understand them, evangelical comprehensiveness. They desired to give all shades of opinion between Pelagianism and Antinomianism an easy berth, and then to counsel theological forbearance and modesty. The entire Article, doctrinal and cautionary, reads as follows:

"Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to ever-

lasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

"As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God: so for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation."—Pages 22, 27.

Certainly this is an Article which no Arminian would draw up in an Arminian confession. With the preconceptions of the present day it is difficult to see it less than Calvinistic. But the sharp doctrinal discriminations of the Dutch Arminians and the English Wesleyans had not then been drawn. The great body of Christian thinkers were in the muddle left by the ages of drawn battle in the Western Church between Augustinism and its opponents. The English Church was in the state of undefined "betweenity," neither Calvinistic nor Arminian exactly, and yet both Calvinistic and Arminian inexactly. The authors of the Article meant a "Broad Church;" and, to say the least, the Calvinists had no excuse for being, as too clearly they sometimes were, dissatisfied, and, perhaps, even factious.

The prominent Calvinistic point of the Article lies in the fact that "chosen" is the first term in the series of soteriological facts. "Predestination" is the "purpose" whereby it is "decreed" to deliver the "chosen." First, there has been a *choice*,

an *election;* then there comes the predestination, purpose, or decree, all essentially one, to deliver the objects of the choice. The objects of the choice are "those," as "vessels of honor." After this choice and decree "to deliver those" comes "called," "obey the calling," "justified," etc. This is Calvinism without an element of Arminianism included—or excluded either.

The Reviewer says truly that the Article is almost purely a series of Scripture clauses. But what a pity that the authors could not, also, according to St. Paul, have based "predestination" on "foreknowledge;" "whom He did foreknow he also did predestinate;" or, as St. Peter, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God." But, alas! that would have shut out the Calvinists and defeated the comprehension. As it stands the Arminian has a right to interpolate the clause in thought, and the Calvinist has no right from the Article itself to condemn the mental assumption. If the Calvinist is pleased to say, I believe it all, the Arminian can say, I believe it all, and more too. If the Calvinist can say, It expresses just what I believe, the Arminian can respond, It contains nothing that I do not believe. Then, say the authors, let it stand just so, and all be modest and good, and we shall get along very well. If that was not acting like wise and Christian religious rulers we know not what would be so. An equal forbearance in the Calvinistic rulers of the Netherlands would have saved the direful disgraces of the Synod of Dort. Arminius and his followers were ready to sign the Belgic Confession as "Articles of agreement, not of authority," or to join in drawing articles of clear and broad evangelic comprehension.

The standard non-Calvinist view of the Article is thus given from Archbishop Lawrence's Bampton Lectures:

"Our Church, on the other hand, always keeping the idea of redemption in view, states it to be the everlasting purpose of the Almighty to deliver from a state of malediction and destruction ('*a maledicto et exitio liberare*') from a guilt which none can themselves obliterate, and to render eternally happy, through Christ or Christianity, as vessels before dishonorable thus formed to honor, those whom he has elected, *not as meritorious individuals separately, but as a certain class of persons, as Christians collectively,* 'whom he has chosen in

Christ out of mankind.'" Again, the same writer says: "In the Institute it is said, 'Prædestinationem vocamus æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid *de unoquoque homine* fieri vellet,' (lib. iii, cap. 21, § 5.) Here the effect of God's predestinating decree is plainly asserted to be the decision of *every man's individual fate.* Our Church, on the other hand, as plainly asserts it to be *the salvation of Christians*, or a liberation from the consequences of transgression, and an adduction to eternal life, through Christianity, of those who are chosen *out of the human race*, 'ex hominum genere.'"—Page 26. It is, therefore, a collective rather than an individual election. Each individual may, we suppose, by faith, enter the collective body of the elect. At least they would have been willing to let him try.

On the non-Calvinistic tenor of the Articles generally we give the following very excellent view:

"The five points of Calvinism may be thus stated: (1) Predestination, including (*a*) unconditional predestination, or election to life eternal, and (*b*) unconditional reprobation, or predestination to damnation; (2) particular or limited redemption, that is, that Christ died only for a chosen few; (3) total depravity; (4) irresistible grace; (5) final perseverance. And the question before us is this: Leaving out of view, at present, the teaching of Article XVII as to predestination to life eternal, what do the Articles teach on the other points enumerated?

"1. As to reprobation, the Articles are pointedly silent. The word itself is not found in them. Nor is there anywhere a statement like that of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith: 'By the *decree* of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life,' and others are foreordained to everlasting death. Yet, beyond all doubt, Calvin considered the theory of reprobation to be essential to his system. For, speaking of those who accept election, but refuse reprobation, he says they do it 'ignorantly and boyishly, since election itself cannot stand unless it is opposed to reprobation.' In such a case omission is surely tantamount to denial.

"2. As against a particular or limited redemption of only the elect, the Articles speak with no 'bated breath.' Article II

sets forth our Lord as 'a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but for *all actual sins of men*;' Article VII asserts that 'everlasting life is offered to *mankind* [*humano generi*] by Christ;' Article XV says of our Lord, 'He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the *sins of the world*;' and Article XXXI declares that 'the offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, *for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual*.' Language cannot be plainer than this. There needs no comment on its outspoken denial of the limited redemption of Calvinism.

"3. The Calvinistic doctrine of original sin implies and includes at least the three things following: (*a*) The imputation of the sin of Adam to all his descendants; (*b*) The utter, total, and positive depravation and defilement of the whole man, 'in all the faculties and parts of soul and body;' and (*c*) that concupiscence, or evil desire, is, in itself, truly and properly sin.'

"Now, the first of these three points is found neither in Article IX nor elsewhere. A mere scholastic speculation at the best, held by Papists as well as Calvinists—though worked out by each in widely different ways—it lies entirely outside of all the Articles, which know and say nothing about it.

"As to the second point, the '*very far gone* from original righteousness' of the Article, even if we take its Latin version, '*quam longissime*,' by no means comes up to the Calvinistic statement. The Assembly of Divines, in 1643, feeling the insufficiency for their purposes of this language, changed it into '*wholly deprived* of original righteousness,' and the Westminster Confession says that by the fall man became '*wholly defiled* in *all the faculties and parts* of soul and body.' This change was needed to bring the Article into an accord, which before it had not, with the teaching of Calvinism. That teaching has been very fairly stated as follows: 'The Calvinists taught that the corruption of man was so great that no spark of moral goodness was left in him; that he was utterly and totally bad and depraved; that, however amiable he might be in regard to his fellow-men, yet, as regards God and goodness, there was no relic of what he once was, any more than in lost spirits and damned souls.'

"As to the third point, the Article asserts that 'concupiscence and lust *hath of itself the nature of sin*;' phraseology in exact accordance with St. Paul's own words, 'Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;' and, again, 'Nay, I had not known *sin*, but by the law: for I had not known *lust*, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' But this language did not content the divines of 1643, who replaced it by the words, 'is truly and properly sin.' While, then, the Article, as against the slur of Trent, retains the apostle's language, it again by no means comes up to the demands of Calvinism."—Pages 17–19.

We intended to trace rapidly the outline of the history, but space and, perhaps, courtesy, require that we should rather refer our readers interested in the subject to the two Reviews themselves.

It is matter of interest to note what Mr. Wesley struck out from the Thirty-Nine Articles on the subject of depravity, regeneration, and sin. The parts expunged we have included in brackets.

"VII. (IX.) *Of Original or Birth Sin.*

"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the [fault and] corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and [is] of his own nature inclined to evil, *and that continually*,

["and therefore in every person born into this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain; yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek, *Φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."]

From this it would seem that Mr. Wesley does not admit that we are born under desert of "God's wrath and damnation." Fasten a pin there.

["(XIII.) *Of Works before Justification.*

"Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God; forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin."]

["(XV.) *Of Christ alone without Sin.*

"Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin (as St. John saith) was not in him. But all we the rest (although baptized and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."]

It will be seen by all this that the English Articles are much more intense than ours, not only in their view of the permanency of "sin" in its damning sense, in our nature, but also *in their view of the existence of responsible "fault" in our nature at generation.* Note the striking out the word "faults."

SOUTHERN REVIEW, April, 1873. (St. Louis, Mo.)—1. The Apostolical Succession. 2. Peggy O'Neal; or, The Doom of the Republic. 3. A Methodist in Search of the Church. 4. Lamon's Life of Lincoln. 5. The Moral Effects of a Free Justification. 6. Darwinism. 7. The Virginia Springs and Mountains. 8. De Natura Gemmarum. 9. The Model Republic: Credit Mobilier.

Of the nine full Articles in this number three are political, two of them partisanly and bitterly political; all "under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," the non-political Church. The Article on Abraham Lincoln is perfectly suited to the tastes of the admirers of John Wilkes Booth.

We give the following passages of statement as to the political character of the Review:

"Some readers and critics, for example, complain that politics are not excluded from the 'Southern Review.' This, we reply, is no longer an open question, having been frankly, freely, and definitely settled long ago. . . . But the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has never *as such* adopted the

'Southern Review' as one of its periodicals, or become in any way responsible either for its teachings or for its pecuniary support. The General Conference which met at Memphis did, it is true, recommend the 'Review' to the confidence and support of Methodists, but they still left it to the private enterprise of the Editor, and to such other friends as might be willing to contribute to its success. All those objections, then, which proceed on the ground that as this is a Church periodical so it should cut loose from all the great political questions and issues of the day, fall to the ground. The premise is false, and therefore the conclusion fails."

On this we remark:

This Review is supported and recommended to the ministers and laity of the Methodist Church by the *concerted action* of Bishops, Editors, and Conferences. It is with the full concurrence of the Bishops and all the authorities that "Published under the auspices of the M. E. Church, South," stands in bold capitals on its cover. The ecclesiastical part, as we understand, is under the supervision of the Bishops; but for the political part a *carte blanche* is given the Editor to publish what he pleases. That political part, with the rest, goes to the Church, thus by compact indorsed, is pressed upon the pockets and reading of the people by all the regular machineries of the Church. It is, therefore, a positive political indoctrination of the Church by the highest authorities of the Church. Whether it is "partisan" or not our readers can judge by the extracts we gave. That it uniformly and violently teaches the doctrines of ultra-Calhounism, secessionism, denationalization, it is a breach of veracity to deny. That the ecclesiastical authorities of any Church should thus prostitute its facilities to the impregnating the soul of their Church with doctrinal treason, preparing it for actual treason whenever the time arrives, is, we believe, unparalleled in the history of American Protestant Churches. But when these very authorities turn round, and in this very Review denounce our Church as "debauched with politics," we think the climax is capped.

We suppose that at the last General Conference, in spite of our having once struck the word "fraternization" from our vocabulary, we should, in deference to the strong and almost

unanimous feeling there prevalent, have voted for the offer. But when we afterward came to read the libel upon our Church above named, sanctioned by their entire bench of Bishops, and compare it with the treasonable utterances sent forth under "the auspices" of that Church, we felt that we should have most profoundly regretted such a vote.

Bibliotheca Sacra, and Theological Eclectic, April, 1873. (Andover, Mass.) —1. St. Elizabeth. 2. Christian Ernest Luthardt on the Design of St. John's Gospel. 3. Miracles. 4. St. Patrick's Purgatory and the Inferno of Dante. 5. The Progress of Christ's Kingdom in its Relation to the Spirit of the Present Age. 6. Revelation and Inspiration. 7. The Chronological Value of the Genealogy in Genesis v. 8. John M'Leod Campbell's Theory of the Atonement. 9. Culmann's Christian Ethics. 10. Strauss's Superficiality. 11. Dr. Hodge and the New England Theology. 12. Recent Works of Prehistoric Archæology.

Professor Lacroix's delineation of St. Elizabeth, in Article I, is an almost romantic leaf snatched from the religious history of the Middle Ages. His trenchant remarks on the modern neglect of, if not disbelief in, *saintship*, curiously illustrate the statements of Leckey on the same subject.—"History of Morals." vol. i, p. 137. It is a topic worthy of study and thought.

Professor Gardiner, in Article VII, shows that the Genesis Chronology is susceptible of a lengthening of some thousands of years by the rejection of the assumption—which may apparently be legitimately done—that the patriarchs named in the pedigrees are eldest sons.

Dr. Pond has a very clearly and respectfully written Article on Dr. Hodge's Theology, in which he specifies and discusses seven essential points in which Dr. Hodge has misstated the "New England" (Calvinistic) "Theology." Our impression is that he makes out a very decided case. But why should our Calvinistic brethren complain that we Arminians cannot state their views correctly, when, it seems, they cannot satisfactorily state each other? It does seem to us that Calvinism is the most unrepresentable thing in the world. Our sincere impression is that when his own opinions are most truly returned back upon him in their true light our Calvinistic brother can hardly believe that he believes them himself. And then when he proceeds to the defense, he will one half the time seem to deny his dogmas, and the other half reiterate them over again.

English Reviews.

London Quarterly Review, April, 1873. (London.)—1. Schools of Jurisprudence. 2. Baring-Gould's Works. 3. Evans' Flint Implements. 4. Middlemarch. 5. Virgil and His Recent English Translators. 6. Napoleon III. 7. The Romanist Doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

We gave in a late "Methodist Quarterly" a condensation of an Article in this Review, impeaching the proof of the geological man drawn from the Flint Implements. It will be remembered that these implements are divided into *neolithic* and *paleolithic*, which terms are "high-sounding Greek" for New-stone and Old-stone. The neoliths are ground on the surface, and often polished; the paleoliths are said to be only "chipped." The reviewer took the ground that the neolithic were indeed implements, but that they did not run back beyond the historic age of the world; and that the paleolithic do run back untold geologic ages, but are not implements. Between the two stools the geologic man, therefore, comes, thump, to the floor! Article Fourth of the present number seems to be a fresh product from the same analytic hand and caustic pen. Both Articles make out a strong case, as far as the unscientific mind can judge.

In the interim Mr. Evans' great work on Flint Implements has appeared. It is received in this country by high authorities as the very highest of authority. We are respectfully instructed to hold it as fixed in science as Newton's Principia. It is "a fine volume of 650 pages, enriched by 500 figures finely engraved, which might indeed be reckoned a thousand, because both a front and side view of most of the objects is given." The reviewer says of the book:

"The author prepared himself to write it by much investigation in paths of literature rarely trodden; by extensive travel for the sake of enlarged and accurate observation; by working in flint and other stone manufacture himself, that he might the better interpret the relics of former times; in short, by the assiduous study of his subject in all its branches; and he has given us a work which, by reason of its extent of information, lucid arrangement, clear and complete references, abundance of excellent pictorial illustrations, and its indexes—the first of which, however, is very defective—must be at once accepted as the standard book on the matters it comprises. Having

studied it, we can highly appreciate the very modest terms in which the writer describes it: 'The work itself will, I believe, be found to contain most of the information at present available with regard to the class of antiquities of which it treats.'" —P. 80.

The most important point of the reviewer's argument is the invalidation of the claim of the paleoliths to be implements.

1. *Workmen have never imagined the paleoliths to be manufactured until after patient indoctrination.*

"When M. Boucher de Perthes began his researches, the men whose employment was digging gravel had never suspected that the flints which fell out had been wrought by human hand. Mr. Evans tells us that 'ordinary laborers require some instruction before they can be brought to recognize even the best wrought forms of flint implements.' Colonel Lane Fox mentions the 'great difficulty which was at first experienced in getting the workmen to notice the artificially formed flints as they fell from the shovel' at Cissbury, 'notwithstanding that all of them had passed their lives in digging in a chalk district.' Does it seem more likely that men of common sense should live and move all their lives amid manufactured articles without suspecting that they had been wrought, or that learned men are the dupes of their own credulity?"—P. 92.

2. *The illimitable quantity of these old stones is disproof of their being manufactured.*

"Another curious circumstance connected with these ancient flint implements is their vast number. They have been found by hundreds and thousands in various places. 'The number almost exceeds belief.' 'They may be said to be ubiquitous,' (p. 251.) Mr. Whitley informs us that half a ton weight was collected in less than an hour, and that he found whole strata of these 'flint implements.' The inference seems to us perfectly clear. That savages should trouble themselves to manufacture myriads of such flints, and throw them away, is not likely. The bits of flint which are found on the surface of the ground in every flinty region, and which may be dug out of every gravel bed—which the workmen never suspected of being artificial till they were set to look for them, and paid for

finding them—are no more artificial than the pebbles on the sea-shore. The paleolithic or old-stone age of men is a fiction." —P. 95.

3. *It is absurd to suppose that there should have been no improvement in the manufacture during the vast ages presupposed by such vast quantities.*

The following is good, both as story and argument:

"In the theory we are discussing it is assumed that, for an enormously long period, men had no weapons or tools but of stone, and almost exclusively of flint, and never advanced beyond the rudest shapes. Common sense revolts against this notion. In every age and country the tools in use will present great variety of both laborious and hasty construction. It is practice and patient toil that make perfect. Savages will spend years in perforating 'cylinders of rock crystal by twirling a flexible leaf-shoot of wild plantain between the hands, and thus grinding the hole with the aid of sand and water;' and others will spend 'a whole life in making a stone tomahawk without entirely finishing it,' (p. 47.) It is altogether incredible that men should live through 'many times ten thousand years,' and make no improvement in processes which are as surely improved by practice as the manufactures of the present day. There is a man well known in England whose name is Edward Simpson, but who has been *alias* 'Fossil Willie,' 'Cockey Bill,' 'Bones,' 'Shirtless,' 'Snake Billy,' 'The Old Antiquarian,' and 'Flint Jack.' Picking up some knowledge of fossils while a servant, he began to collect them about Whitby, and sell them, earning a good living. A dealer in curiosities showed him a flint arrow-head, and asked him if he could make one like it. He took the hint, and became the prince of fabricators of antiques, flints of every form, celts, stone-hammers, ancient pottery, inscribed stones, fibulæ, querns, armor, and every conceivable thing. His productions have taken in the most learned, and are to be found in the cabinets of collectors every-where. He produced a stone with a cross on it, surrounded by the letters Imp. Constant. Ebur., which was sent about to various antiquaries, and, strange to say, baffled their skill. He produced a flint comb, and the *savants* could make nothing of it, unless that it might have been used for tattooing. Scarborough, Hull, Newark, Grantham, Stamford, Peterborough, were

enriched by his treasures. Finding out the metropolitan market where his Jewish salesmen traded, he proceeded to London to do business on his own account. 'Did you take them in at the British Museum?' 'Why, *of course* I did. . . . They have lots of my things, and good things they are, too.' Leaving the curiosity shops of the great city well supplied, Jack went northward again by Bedford and Northampton, at which latter place he was very successful. Market Harborough proved a barren town to him, but at Leicester he got to the Museum and succeeded. At Nottingham he found two antiquaries, and duped them both. Durham and the Lake district, York, Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, the West of England, Scotland, and Ireland—in which last-named country he found an excellent market—have been supplied with his productions, which he sometimes adroitly mixed with a few real fossils. The secret at length came out, and Jack reached the climax of his fame. A meeting of the Geological Association was held in London, at which it was understood some curious discoveries would be made. The place of meeting, except the seats reserved for dignitaries, was fully occupied, when in walked a man in tattered clothes, boots heavy and dirty, his face like a gipsy's, his hair hanging in lank locks, a greasy hat in his hand, and a bundle in a dingy red cotton handkerchief. Putting his hat on the ground on one side, and his bundle on the other, he seated himself, amid the titter of the ladies on the reserved seats, seemed quite at his ease, and then, approaching the table, carefully inspected the curiosities exhibited on it. When some preliminary proceedings were over, Jack, at a signal given, producing from his bundle nodules of flint and a piece of iron, astonished and greatly amused the spectators by the skill and speed with which he prepared any sort of flint implements desired. He was the hero of the evening, and left with his pocket well furnished with sixpences, the price of his manufactures. Mr. Evans imagines that men went on chipping flints throughout unnumbered ages, without there being one Flint Jack, or any advance on the very rude forms of flint work. It is wonderful that intelligent men do not perceive that the theory carries its own refutation. Can he cite a single instance in which a savage tribe has gone on even for centuries with no manifestations of skill beyond a

piece of barely chipped flint? We suspect he felt the difficulty, and, to shield himself, had recourse to the desperate expedient of suggesting that possibly the men of the Paleolithic age were a different race from the present!"—P. 93–95.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historical Theology.) 1873. Third Number.—1. DR. BRANDEIS, Life of Duplessis-Mornay, (First Article.) 2. ALBERT, From What Motives did Dr. Eck Engage in the Disputation with Martin Luther at Leipzic? 3. LAUBMANN, Biographical and Bibliographical Notes on M. Sebastian Froschel. 4. VOIGTLANDER, Gregory of Cyprus. 5. SEIDEMANN, A Letter from Justus Jonas, dated 1518.

Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, whose biography is begun in the first article, was one of the leaders of the Huguenots, in the times of Charles IX., Henry III., and Henry IV. Descended both on father's and mother's side from ancient families of the highest nobility, and being himself distinguished by his irreproachable character, as well as his ability as a diplomatist, he could not fail to become a man of superior influence. In 1575 he entered the service of the Protestant king of Navarre, who, later, as Henry IV., ascended the throne of France, and employed him in many important diplomatic transactions, and during the war of the League relied upon him as his chief adviser. When Henry, in order to secure the French throne, believed it necessary to join the Church of Rome, Mornay not only did not follow the example of the king, but frankly reproached him for selling his religion in consideration of political advantages. Nevertheless, Henry made him a Counselor of State, and subsequently Governor of Saumur, where he established an academy for the Huguenots. In 1620 he undertook the defense of Protestantism in a public disputation at Fontainebleau with Bishop Duperron, of Evreux, and in 1620, when the Huguenots rose in arms for the defense of their religion, he endeavored to effect a reconciliation between the two parties, and, on that account, lost his governorship. In the preface the author of this new biography calls attention to the fatal influence which Henry's change of religion has had upon the destinies of France. The example of Henry to regard religion as a means for attaining political purposes, and

to make to the Church of Rome far-going concessions in order to strengthen his power, has become the leading principle by which the succeeding rulers of France have regulated their treatment of religious affairs. Louis XIV., Napoleon I., and Napoleon III. stand forth in history as prominent representatives of this policy. How different, the biographer of Duplessis exclaims, might have been the fate of France if Henry IV. had remained faithful to his Protestant religion!

The public theological disputation of Luther with the most prominent of his theological opponents, Dr. Eck, is no less a matter of general interest than the life of the great French Huguenot. That Dr. Eck was a man of great learning and ability is admitted by all his opponents. The result of the disputation was, even at the time of Luther, and is still, a subject of controversy between the Protestant and Catholic writers. But the motives which prompted him to seek these public disputations were, according to the author of the second article, not pure. It seems from the numerous references to the works of that period that even the friends and admirers of Dr. Eck thought less of his moral character than of his literary ability.

Gregory of Cyprus, the subject of the fourth article of the journal, became, in 1283, Patriarch of Constantinople, his predecessor, John Veccus, having been exiled to Brusa for favoring the union of the Greek Church with that of Rome. Gregory, a good scholar and well-meaning bishop, had to struggle hard against the party which advocated the union, and the result of this struggle was not as favorable as he expected. The Church sank more and more deeply into lethargy and demoralization, and Gregory, despairing of being able to improve the condition of the Church, resigned in 1289. One year later, in 1290, he died.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1873. Third Number.—*Essays:* 1, MUCKE, Luther's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper before 1522. 2. KAHLER, The Addresses of the Apostle Peter in the Acts. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. WEISS, Notes on the Article by Dr. W. Grimm. On the Problem of the First Epistle of Peter. *Reviews:* 1. Keim, History of Jesus of Nazareth, reviewed by RONSCH. 2. Nitzch, Outline of a History of Christian Doctrines, Vol. I, reviewed by MOLLER.

French Reviews.

Revue Chretienne. (Christian Review.) January, 1873.—1. Secretan, St. Beuve and Christianity, (First Article.) 2. Waddington, The Antecedents of the Philosophy of the "Renaissance." 3. Doumergue, The Revolution in Prussia.

February.—1. Secretan, St. Beuve and Christianity. (Second Article.) 2. Doumergue, The Change in the Prussian Ministry. 3. Roller, The Church Property Question in Italy. 4. Bonifas, Why Corneille has not been our Shakspeare.

March.—1. Babut, Progress. 2. Lichtenberger, The Two Moralities. 3. E. de Guerle, The Childhood of Mozart, (First Article.) 4. Rossieuw St. Hilaire, Providential Harmonies.

April.—1. Pressense, Three Discourses on the Unity of the Church, (First Article: The Basis and the Condition of True Evangelical Catholicity.) 2. E. de Guerle, The Childhood of Mozart. (Second Article.) 3. Ch. Bois, The Lyrical Poetry of the Hebrews, (First Article.)

The "Revue Chretienne," of Paris, maintains its position as the most prominent periodical of French Protestantism. Many of its articles, as the above list shows, are devoted to the great questions of the day, which receive a thorough and interesting discussion from the stand-point of evangelical Protestantism. The "Revue" is one of the few evangelical papers of Continental Europe which zealously defend the principle of a complete separation between Church and State. It can, therefore, not fully concur in the praise now so generally bestowed upon the Governments of Prussia and Italy in their conflicts with the Church of Rome. It is far from believing in a reconciliation between Rome and Protestantism; and in announcing, in one of its last numbers, the new work of Guizot on the "Lives of Four Great French Christians," it takes occasion to express its emphatic dissent from the celebrated Protestant statesman, who declares that Protestantism and Roman Catholicism draw nearer every day, and that now, more easily than ever, they can unite in the war against evil and error. It strongly urges the withdrawal of all State support from an establishment which inculcates doctrines so incompatible with the best interests of society as the Church of Rome. But it also insists that the only possible way to do this is to sever altogether the bond between the State Government and the Churches generally, and to allow the Churches to govern themselves, independent of, but also unsupported by, the State. On that account it disapproves of the attempt of the Prussian Government to curb the power of Rome by partly transferring the control of ecclesiastical schools and Church property from the bishops to the State authorities, and the attempt of the

Italian Government to purchase the consent of the Pope to the abolition of his temporal power by large concessions to his spiritual authority.

The most interesting article in the four numbers whose contents have been quoted above is the one on the reunion of the Christian Churches, by E. de Pressensé. The article in the April number is the first of a series of three. After a brief review of former efforts in this direction it gives due praise to the Old Catholics of Germany, for having, immediately after protesting against the new Papal usurpations, expressed a wish for a reconciliation between the great divisions of the Christian world, and for having appointed a special committee to open negotiations with the other Churches. Pressensé expresses great admiration of the Old Catholic movement, and of the noble sentiments which he heard expressed at the second Congress of Cologne by its leaders. He agrees with them, that the unity of the Christian Church corresponds to the true spirit of Christianity, and develops at length his reasons for this belief. He warns Protestants not to think too lightly of the existing divisions, and not to console themselves too easily with the distinction between the invisible and the visible Church. All should rather strive that the unity existing in the invisible Church become more and more visible. There is now one great bond which unites all true Christians, the belief in the God-man Jesus Christ. The Church of the first three centuries was united on this basis. The early Christians who came from Judaism differed in some points from those who came from paganism, but they recognized each other as Christians, and the first Council—that of Jerusalem—sanctioned this mutual recognition. During the first three centuries the Church of the East and that of the West developed two different types of Christianity, but they did not on that account excommunicate each other, but recognized each other's Christian character. It was only the union of the State with the Church—the establishment of the State-Church system—which interfered with the freedom of the early Church, and established a hierarchy, which persecuted differences of belief with fire and sword. The second article will discuss the obstacles to a union of the Christian Churches; and the third will show by what means it may be promoted.

Art. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

The Old Catholic Church.—The second General Congress of the Old Catholics, which was held at Cologne, and of which a full account was given in the January number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review," (page 144, *sqq.*,) greatly strengthened the hopes of the Old Catholics and their friends for ultimate success. It must be admitted that the bishops and priests of Germany appear to oppose the further advance of the reformatory movement as a formidable phalanx, and that the progress of the Old Catholics, as far as the accession of new members is concerned, does not appear to be very rapid. But few priests have joined it since the close of the Congress, the most prominent among whom is a canon of the cathedral church of Breslau, Von Richthofen, who, in May, 1873, issued a declaration by which he withdraws the submission reluctantly made to the decrees of the Vatican Council, and joins in the protest against the œcumenical character of the Council, and the orthodoxy of the novel doctrine of Papal Infallibility. In a number of places the adherents of the movement have constituted themselves into Old Catholic congregations, and district associations have displayed considerable zeal in supplying, as far as the small number of Catholic priests will allow, the religious wants of the much more numerous congregations. Their chief attention, however, has been directed to the efforts for obtaining from the State Governments a recognition of their claims to at least a fair share of the Church property of the Catholic Church of Germany; for they insist as strongly as ever that they are unwaveringly attached to that form of the Catholic Church which alone existed in Germany prior to 1870, and which alone was recognized as the State Church by the secular Governments. They have already met with considerable success in the Grand Duchy of Baden. In the old episcopal city of Constance, famous in history by the Œcumenical Council which, while endeavoring to introduce sweeping reforms in spite of the Pope, yet on the other hand sacrificed the life of the heretical John Huss to the phantom of the visible unity of the Church—a large number of Old Catholic citizens demanded from the Government the transfer to them of one of the Catholic churches of the city. The Government, anxious to ascertain the real views of the population, ordered a general vote of the Catholic adult population to be taken, when it was found that very nearly one half of the citizens declared their adhesion to the Old Catholic Church. The Ministry thereupon declared them to be entitled to the joint use of one of the churches, and when the parish priest refused to respect the order of the Government, put them in temporary possession of the church. The example of Constance was soon followed by the Catholic citizens of Waldshut, Thœngen, Zurtwangen, and other towns of Baden. In Bavaria, the Central Committee of the Old Catholics of the Palatinate petitioned the Government to pay the salaries of their priests from the pub-

lic treasury. The town councils of several towns of Prussia resolved no longer to allow the doctrine of Papal Infallibility to be taught at the town schools. But the most important step which has yet been taken in Germany is the election of the first Old Catholic bishop, which took place on June 4 at Cologne. The new Church is now completed, and active efforts to organize congregations in all the important places in Germany may shortly be looked for.

The little sympathy which Old Catholicism finds in France is a subject of surprise. Father Hyacinthe has left France, and accepted a call to Geneva, Switzerland, and as he alone among the Old Catholic priests has married without awaiting the action of the Old Catholic Church with regard to the marriage of priests, he is not in full harmony with the leaders of the movement in Germany. The Old Catholics have, however, one very energetic and gifted champion in Abbé Michaud, who continues to appeal to public opinion in able pamphlets, and has organized a regular Old Catholic congregation in Paris. The Old Catholic Committees which have been organized in Rome (Feb. 11, 1872) and in Madrid appear to have done but little; at least no real progress seems to have been made in the organization of congregations. In Austria, likewise, but little headway is made; in Austria Proper (or Cisleithania) the Ministry, which claims to be liberal in politics, officially recognizes only the adherents of the Papal Infallibility as Catholics, while the Hungarian Ministry confines itself to official refusals to recognize the doctrine of Infallibility.

All the more important, on the other hand, has the movement become in Switzerland, where it has led to an open conflict between the Catholic bishops on the one hand, and the liberal, federal, and cantonal authority on the other. The six bishops of Switzerland are a unit both in submitting themselves to the Vatican Council and in enforcing the submission of the lower clergy. The Federal authority of Berne, on the other hand, and the Governments of those cantons which are under the control of Protestants or Liberal Catholics, have taken the ground that this new doctrine was not a part of the Church which Switzerland has until 1870 recognized as the Catholic State Church, and that the bishops had no right to remove from their places the priests who were faithful to the Old Church. When, therefore, Bishop Lachat of Basle, whose diocese is formed by the cantons of Berne, Solothurn, Aargau, Basle City, Basle Canton, Thurgau, Lucerne, and Zug, excommunicated and deposed an Old Catholic priest in the canton of Solothurn, the Government of this canton, with the assent of the congregation, protected the parish priest in his office, and the diocesan conference, (consisting of the representatives of the seven cantons,) on November 19, 1872, requested the bishop to revoke the sentences of excommunication and deposition. The people of the canton, which, according to the census of 1870, had, in a total population of 74,713, 62,072 Catholics, supported their Government against the bishop, and on December 22, 1872, ratified a new law which provides for the election of all parish priests by the people of the par-

ishes for a term of only six years. A number of towns at the same time forbade the preaching of the doctrines of Infallibility in their churches. As the bishop persisted in refusing to recognize the authority of the Cantonal Governments, the diocesan conference, by five against two votes, (Lucerne and Zug,) resolved to depose him, and requested the chapter to elect a new bishop. The chapter declined to comply with this request; the cantons of Lucerne and Zug declared that they would continue to recognize the episcopal authority of Bishop Lachat; the clergy of the entire diocese, with few exceptions, declared their concurrence with the action of the bishop, and, at a general vote taken in the canton of Thurgau, an overwhelming majority of the Catholic population expressed the same sentiments. The diocesan conference was, however, not intimidated by these occurrences. An attempt of the Ultramontane party of Solothurn to vote the Liberal Government of the canton out of office did not succeed. The Government of Berne deposed ninety-seven priests who refused obedience to their decrees, and the Government of Solothurn exiled the bishop, (who had his residence in the city of Solothurn.) A similar step was taken by the Government of Geneva against Bishop Mermillod, whom the Pope, without giving any notice to the Swiss authorities, had appointed bishop of the newly-created diocese of Geneva. The cantons of both Geneva and Neuchatel, in March, 1873, adopted laws providing for the periodical election of the Catholic priests by the people of their parishes.

The Imperial Government of Germany is proceeding in its conflict with the Catholic bishops with the utmost caution. It has begun with submitting to the Prussian Diet four laws which intend to weaken the absolute control of the bishops upon the education of the Catholic priests and upon the Catholic public schools, and in March, 1873, these laws were adapted by the Diet. They are supposed to be forerunners of others which are to give to the State Government a control of the administration of the Church property, after which it is expected the Government will be prepared to recognize the claims of the Old Catholics. Though many are chafing at the surprisingly slow movements of the Prussian Government the attitude of Prince Bismarck is so decided that no fears are entertained with regard to the final issue of the conflict.

GREEK CHURCH.

The excommunication of the Bulgarians by the Holy and Grand Council of Constantinople, in September, 1872, (see "Methodist Quarterly Review," January, 1873, p. 148,) soon created new troubles. The Greeks of Turkey and Greece gave to the decree of excommunication a fanatical support. The refusal of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Kyrillos, to sign the decree, called forth on the part of the clergy and people of his patriarchate the greatest indignation. A synod of the bishops of the patriarchate of Jerusalem at once met in Jerusalem, admonished their Patriarch to submit to the declaration of the Council, and when he

definitively refused, deposed him from his office. The following translation of his official decree of deposition is a very interesting contribution to the recent history of the Greek Church:

"To-day, Tuesday, November 7, of the year 1872, in the twelfth hour, all the episcopal members of the Holy Synod of Jerusalem, after assembling in the hall of the synodal sessions of the monastery of the Holy Sepulcher, and after taking into consideration the last definite answer of his Holiness, the Patriarch, Kyrillos II., relative to the acceptance of the resolution of the Grand and Holy Council legally and canonically convoked at Constantinople—by which resolution phyletism (that is, the distinction of races and nationalities in the Church) was rejected and condemned, and all who approved this phyletism, and who, inspired thereby, have held up to this day illegal and clandestine meetings, were declared to be schismatics—have unanimously decreed and do decree as follows:

"In consideration that his Holiness—trampling under foot all that he had written in his synodal letter of January 24, 1869, to the Grand Church—not only acted arbitrarily in Constantinople and refused to join in the recognition of the Grand Council, but that he also, in Jerusalem, obstinately, and without sufficient reason, opposed to the invitations and prayers addressed by us to him the refusal to submit with us to the resolution of the Grand Council;

"In consideration of all this, we consider him as having incurred the ecclesiastical censures which are expressly contained in the said resolution of the Grand Council, and as being, *de facto*, schismatic. And we find ourselves in the sad and painful necessity to take back the oath of submissiveness and obedience taken by us toward him, and henceforth to break off all connection and communion with him, and we shall never more perform any function with him, or in any respect act with him, and we shall no longer recognize him as head, and as our lawful and canonical shepherd. In confirmation of which the present act has been compiled and entered into the great book of the Patriarchal Throne of Jerusalem. Moreover, copies of this act have been sent to the Grand Church and to all independent Orthodox Churches."

Both the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Turkish Government, which was likely notified of the resolution of the Council of Jerusalem, recognized the deposition of the Patriarch and gave permission for the election of a new Patriarch. But before this took place Jerusalem was the scene of considerable agitation. The deposed Patriarch refused to recognize the lawfulness of his deposition, and declared his intention to celebrate, on November 23, vespers in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. The clergy and the monks refused to assist him. From the surrounding country an excited crowd of adherents of the Patriarch, led by the Russian dragoman, invaded Jerusalem, spreading considerable alarm among the opponents of the Patriarch. Police soldiers entered the cells of the monks in order to drag them before the Patriarch. As the monks offered resistance the state of siege was declared, and the monks

shut up in the monastery of the Holy Sepulcher. The Patriarch, in the evening, and again on the next day, repaired to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, attended by the Russian and Greek consuls. When the consuls of the other Powers asked the Governor of Jerusalem for the cause of this uncommon movement, he replied that the Greeks wished to protect the Patriarch who had been deposed by his clergy, and that he (the Governor) regarded it as his duty to support the Patriarch against the revolutionary clergy. The Consul-General of Germany replied that the Governor seemed to him to exceed his powers, for the organic statutes of the Patriarchate provided for the election of the Patriarch by the clergy, who, therefore, had also the power to depose him, while the laity were nowhere mentioned. The Governor then confessed that he was not free, and that the Russian consul had threatened him with deposition in case he should fail to support the Patriarch. Appeal was then made to the Turkish government; the consuls reported to their Governments, and the clergy elected a deputation to go to Constantinople. The Porte, in agreement with the Patriarch of Constantinople, instructed the Governor of Jerusalem by telegraph to protect the clergy, and no longer to recognize Kyrillos as Patriarch. The Greek Government at once deposed the Greek consul, and the Porte forbade all the newspapers to publish any more polemical articles on the question, and ordered the deposed Patriarch to take up his abode in the little island Prinkipo, in the sea of Marmora.

The bishops who had signed the decree of deposition were the Archbishop of Gaza and the Bishops of Lydda, Neapolis, (Nablus,) Sebasta Tabor, Philadelphia, Jordan, and Tiberias. They then elected the Archbishop of Gaza Patriarch of Jerusalem. The bishops and archimandrites who at first sided with Kyrillos soon deemed it the safest to declare their submission, which they did in the following letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople:

"*To his Holiness the Œcumenical Patriarch Anthimos, Jerusalem, December* 10, (N. S. 22,) 1872. We, the undersigned, the Metropolitans Agapios of Bethlehem and Niphon of Nazareth, and the Archimandrites Yussuf, Chrysanthos, Joseph, Gregorios, and the Protosyngels Daniel, Gabriel, and the others of our party among the monks of Mar Saba, (a monastery not far from the Dead Sea,) have for a moment sided with the ex-Patriarch, Kyrillos, and have, by our telegram of November 27, (N. S. December 9,) protested against the resolution of the Synod of Jerusalem. But having already repented, we implore the indulgence of the Church and humbly pray for pardon, as we recognize all the resolutions of the Synod of Jerusalem, and turn away from Kyrillos."

The Russian Government soon gave another proof of its sympathy with Kyrillos and with the Bulgarians by laying embargo upon all the property of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem which is situated within the territory of Russia. This property embraced about thirty estates, situated in the best districts of Bessarabia, and yielding an annual rent of 200,000 rubles. At the same time the Russian embassador in Constanti-

nople must have interceded in behalf of the deposed Kyrillos with great energy, for the Turkish Government not only set him free after a few weeks, but also asked his pardon for the injury done him.

In Constantinople, in the meanwhile, the Œcumenical Patriarch had in November prevailed upon the Turkish Government to ask the Bulgarian Exarch to make propositions with regard to a change in the clerical dress of the Bulgarian clergy, so as to distinguish them from those in ecclesiastical communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Exarch was afraid that the abandonment of a dress which the mass of the people looked upon as an integral part of the clerical dignity might be injurious to the interests of the Bulgarian Church, and he therefore refused to make the demanded change.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

RUSSIA.

The German translation of a history of the Russian Church by Philaret, (*Geschichte der Kirche Russlands*,) formerly Archbishop of Tchernigov, gives the German literary periodicals occasion to review the theological literature of Russia, a subject on which, outside of Russia, but little is known. Particularly valuable is an article on the subject in the *Theologische Literaturblatt*, of Bonn, by Professor Reinkens, of Breslau, (who was recently elected First Bishop of the Old Catholics.) The theological literature of Russia before the eighteenth century is of little interest. At the beginning of this century, the Archbishop Theophan Procopovitch, of Novgorod, (1681–1736,) a man of considerable learning, published a number of works, which, however, had more practical than scientific purposes in view. Thus he wrote on the patriarchal dignity and on the Church constitution of the first four centuries, in order to show that the establishment of the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg was a justifiable measure. The doctrinal works had mostly a polemical character; the biographies were mostly eulogistic; the best cultivated branch was that of homiletics. Several attempts to awaken an interest in Church history by the translation of standard French works, as "Fleury" and "Tillemont," failed; the translations of these works, after having been made, were not even printed. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, (1805,) a brief Russian Church history was published by Plato Levshin, Metropolitan of Moscow. This book is without literary value, an unskilled compilation of facts of Russian chronicles; but it was used as a text-book in the Russian schools for about fifty years. The best feature of the book was the author's manifest desire to tell nothing but the truth. Another Church history of Russia, (which was also translated into German,) by the statesman Muraviev, was not liked even by the Russian clergy, as it was too biographical. The history of the Russian Church by Philaret was the first work of importance. It was published from 1850 to 1859, and, by order of the Holy Synod, was introduced into the ecclesiastical

seminaries, (institutions ranking between the ecclesiastical schools and ecclesiastical academies.) Within ten years four editions were published. The author divides the history of the Russian Church into five periods: the first closes with the inroads of the Mongolians in 1237; the second embraces the time of the subjection of Russia by the Mongolians, 1238 to 1409; the third extends to the establishment of a Patriarchate, 1587; the fourth to the abolition of the Patriarchate in 1719; the fifth comprises the administration of the Church of the Holy Synod. The value of the German translation is considerably enhanced by a treatise on the Liturgy of the Oriental Greek Church and the Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Doctrine by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, which has been introduced into all the schools of Russia.

Philaret was one of the greatest scholars of his Church. He has published, besides the history of the Russian Church, the following works: 1. A System of Christian Doctrines, two volumes; 2. A work on the Saints of Russia; 3. Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavi; 4. The Liturgy of the Russian Church before the Invasion of the Mongolians; 5. A work on the Church Fathers, in three volumes, and an extract from it as a text-book; 6. A Commentary to the Epistle to the Galatians; 7. An Outline of the Theological Literature of Russia, two volumes; 8. Sermons, Homilies, and Addresses, four volumes.

The Church history of Philaret has given a great impulse to the study of this branch of theology in Russia. A number of special works have since been published, and a number of important questions have been thoroughly discussed in the theological periodicals of Russia, of which there are now eight; in particular, in the *Orthodox Companion*, which is published by the ecclesiastical academy of Kasan. Macarius, Archbishop of Lithuania, (who resides at Vilna,) has repeatedly offered rewards of one thousand rubles for new text-books for the theological seminaries, which the Committee of the Holy Synod on Instruction awards. In 1870 two prizes were awarded to professors of the ecclesiastical academy of Kasan; one, for a new "Manual of Russian Church History," to Professor Snamensky, and the other to Professor Porfirev, for his "History of Russian Literature." Archbishop Macarius, of Lithuania, (formerly Bishop of Winnozze, and rector of the ecclesiastical academy in St. Petersburg,) is the most learned Church historian, and probably the greatest theologian of Russia now living. He has written the ablest Russian work on systematic theology, (dogmatics,) which has also been translated into French, and has begun a comprehensive history of the Russian Church which by far surpasses in literary merit the work of Philaret. The sixth volume of this work, which appeared in 1870, carries the history of the Church to the establishment of the Patriarchate in 1587.

From the annual report of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod for 1869, which is added to the German translation, we learn that the Russian Church has 1,322 ecclesiastical schools, with 31,925 pupils; 51 seminaries, with 730 teachers and 14,846 pupils; 4 academies, in Kiev, Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Kasan, with 90 teachers and 395 students.

Art. IX.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Systematic Theology. By Charles Hodge, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Three vols., 8vo., pp. 647, 732, 880. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872–73.

Index to Systematic Theology. By Charles Hodge, D.D. 8vo., pp. 811. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873. 1

In enumerating the many intellectual monarchs so singularly numerous at the present day, whose heads are crowned with the glory of years and honors, Thiers, Guizot, Wilhelm, Bryant, etc., neither last nor least should stand the name of Charles Hodge. We remember him early in our own under-graduate days as the then eminent professor and editor. His Theology, of three volumes octavo and two thousand total pages, is not only the solid deposit of his earlier and maturer years, but its argument, brought down to the latest dates, is as young and fresh as it is old and permanent. The serene repose of his age is doubtless too self-possessed to be *proud* of any thing; but great must be his satisfaction at surveying this massive life's *work*, the *memento* of years of thought, the strong *defense* of his faith, a monument and a muniment.

There is a large amount of this Theology which speaks clearly and ably the common doctrines of the evangelical Church. It does not possess the stately vigor nor the rapid decisive logic of Watson; but its learning is more rich and wide, and, as a statement and history of the various doctrinal views that have held possession in the Church, it has a value for every theological inquirer. The style is neither sententious nor rhetorical, but natural and perspicuous, seldom requiring a sentence to be read a second time in order to be understood. It is to be regretted that so many extended passages occur in German and Latin—rarely in any other language—untranslated. If it be important to give the very words, a foot-note translation should be added. Complaint there is, indeed, from theologians in different quarters, that *their* views are not correctly stated; but no human hand, guided by a human intellect, could so frame statements on so extended a scale as to avoid the possibility of such complaints. His statements, to our own eye, are sometimes, though exceptionally, colored and framed for the result to be finally deduced. And yet there is an immense remainder, written in a style of perfect perspicuity, which the whole Protestant Church can gratefully accept, and write its author among its honored names.

But there is central within it a sad anachronism. Its central theology is, fatally for it, the theology of *fatalism*. It is the theology neither of the morning nor the evening of the Christian Church. It was begotten in the Middle Ages, and is already obsolescent and ready to vanish away. It is dying from out the pulpit where it once reigned, and the stately tomes within which it is embodied have within themselves the sentence of already approaching death. The fatal death-spot in Dr. Hodge's theology is this FATALISM. He manifests his consciousness of this fact by his plentiful flounces and flounderings upon the subject. He denounces fatalism, proclaims *freedom*, free-agency, responsibility, in high-sounding words and periods. But all in vain. "Hæret lethalis arundo"—the fatal arrow sticks, and the struggling victim is doomed. His wordy dissertations of long pages can be answered in as many lines. For analyze his freedom, and you soon find that it ultimates in fatalism. The central fatal point is this—*Dr. Hodge teaches that all the damned are damned for what they could not help.* His freedom is the same old clock-hammer freedom—the power of doing no otherwise that you do. Every sin ever committed was inevitable sin. Every reprobate is damned for sin he never could avoid. And the theology that teaches that is itself doomed. Such a theology, gendered in the addled brains of schoolmen, is contradicted by the plain moral sense and common sense of mankind; and just so fast as that common sense comes to confidence in itself does that theology stand before its bar, *condemned*. Or, to say the same thing more in the terms of science: such a theology is contradicted by the highest and purest spiritual *intuitions* written by God's own finger on the tablets of the human soul. God and man, therefore, pronounce it untruth. It is an insult to man, and a libel upon God. It fails to be blasphemy only because the *intention* of blasphemy is absent, and the heart is really, though mistakenly, reverent. If Dr. Hodge's spirit truly worships the God his theology describes, he and we worship two different deities. For we should fear as a mortal sin to worship the awful Phantasm his theology pictures. That Phantasm we are ethically bound to hate and abhor with all our heart, might, mind, and strength. Should we ethically love that Phantasm, and thereby become transformed to its ethical likeness, we should unquestionably become a devil. But we believe, as we have often intimated, that the *spirit* of men like Dr. Hodge does most truly worship, not the Phantasm of their *understanding*, but the true and holy God. Through all the mists of our human error, God recog-

nizes the *purpose* of true and humble worship, appropriates that worship to himself, and returns it back in blessing on the worshiper. And thus we hold that there is many a transubstantiationist who is no real idolater. Even through the wafer symbol God can know the holy purpose, and take the worship to himself. Hence there has been, and is, many a Catholic, as well as many a Calvinist, upon whose piety we look with profound reverence and love.

Dr. Hodge skillfully aims to impart status and archaic dignity to his theology by presenting it as "*the theology of the Reformation.*" He bestows this title not only upon what *we* call "*the theology of the Reformation*"—including only those basal principles by which the whole papal hierarchism is contradicted and overthrown, namely, *the supreme authority of Scripture* and *justification by faith*—but those points which many a Romanist could indorse, as *imputation* and *predestination*. Pupils and readers alike Dr. Hodge reins up to understand that the Bible is to be interpreted by the old Reformers. Their works take the place for Protestants occupied by "tradition" for Catholics. From their high original Lutheranism, Arminianism and Wesleyanism are each a degeneration, at greater and greater distances and descents. Some of the unlovely phases, however, of that "theology of the Reformation" are exhibited in the Fourth Article of this present Quarterly. Its exhibit is amply sufficient to show that, however grateful we may be to the Reformers for their heroism in action, we can hardly accept them as our entire masters of doctrine. Dr. H. slurs the three or four first centuries of the Christian era as undeveloped in their doctrines. The age of "systematic theology" came with Augustine. But he depreciates the post-apostolic age because the post-apostolic age depreciates him. He pronounces it "undeveloped" because it pronounces him unorthodox. In common with Arminius and Wesley, we revere these holy, martyr, primitive centuries. We believe that they were as orthodox as any age that has succeeded them. We believe that they had a more coherent and a far truer theology than Augustine or Calvin. If we are to choose between the two ages, we would by far trust ourself, for soundness of doctrine and certainty of salvation, with the Church of Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Origen and Irenæus than with that of Zuinglius, Calvin, Gomarus and Bogerman. This recurrence to the primitive Christianity is a process now in progress, at which many thinkers are in an unnecessary fright. They mistake as an abandonment of faith what is truly an abandonment of dogmatic scholasticism and a return to the primitive simplicity of the true faith. The

Pagan philosopher, Pliny, reported to Trajan, Emperor of Rome, in the closing days of the first century, that the Christians were guilty of nothing more than meeting before daylight, on a regular day, singing a hymn to Christ as to God, and partaking a harmless meal. Here was the Sabbath, the divinity of Christ, and the sacrament; an outline of Christian faith and practice. And these simple believers had a "theology" for which they were willing to live or die. It made them holy in life, and heroic and happy in the final hour. If the interpretation of Scripture needs a regulative aid, let us seek it in the age most near to the Scripture writers. *We shall find no predestination there!*

The Doctrine of Hell; Ventilated in a Discussion between the Rev. C. A. Walworth and William Henry Burr, Esq. 24mo., pp. 151. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1873.

A decidedly piquant though eminently courteous discussion, with an interesting history to it. Mr. Walworth, son of the late Chancellor, and Mr. Burr, were college classmates, and both were "converted" at the same "revival" under Elder Knapp, and "got religion." Like the two Newmans, they thence diverged in opposite directions: Walworth to Catholicism, and Burr to infidelity, spiritualism, and an editorship of the Boston "Investigator." Being misrepresented in that paper as doubting Papal infallibility, Walworth interposes a denial in the infidel columns, and with explicit clearness professes his faith in that dogma which amazes alike Christendom and Infideldom. Thereupon Mr. Burr lights down upon the daring priest, who meets him with the most admirable presence of mind, fluent style, and dialectic skill. Much of that skill is displayed, however, in non-commitalism; in refusing to accept quotations from current Romanistic literature actually circulated by the authorized machineries of the Church, and declining to admit any thing outside the two hundred and seventy-six pages octavo of the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent.

Mr. Burr in his first salute twits both Mr. Walworth and himself with their "conversion," owns his contempt for the whole affair, especially for Mr. Knapp's appalling pictures of hell, and taunts Mr. Walworth with the inquiry, What does he think about it? To his surprise, doubtless, Mr. Walworth replies:

> Why should I look upon that early "conversion" as a delusion? It was based upon a faith which I then had and still have. I look back to it with pleasure. I feel grateful to Elder Knapp for the part which he had in it. I look back with love and reverence to my parents first, and, after them, to every voice that ever taught me to believe, or sought to rouse my believing conscience to its duty.

My answer to Mr. Burr's question must not be understood as an indorsement of Protestantism in any form. I do not look upon Protestant Churches as channels of grace, or as having any divine authority whatever. They are merely human institutions, and owe their origin to rebellion against the Church of Christ. If I entertain hopes of the salvation of individual Protestants, it is because, by their baptism, by that portion of Christian doctrine to which they still hold, and by the living faith and love of God which is in them, they are members of the true Catholic Church, united by this lien to the *soul* of that Church, although unconsciously astray from her *body* or visible fold.—Pp. 18, 19.

On the nature of Hell Mr. Walworth thus gives his views, which are those of "Catholic theologians," and uncondemned, it would seem, if not asserted, by Trent:

It is impossible to have any clear and adequate idea of hell without a correct notion of heaven. That state of final beatitude which we call heaven consists in the everlasting vision of God. There, as the apostle tells us, we shall see him as he is, and face to face. This is not a natural state. No conceivable perfectibility of man in the natural order could ever attain to it. It is something supernatural, that is, a gift above and beyond man's nature. It lies in a higher plane. For this supernatural end, nevertheless, man was created. It is his original destiny, God's ultimate design in his creation, reaching not only beyond such happiness as is attainable in this life, but also beyond the range and scope of his natural powers in any future life. To reach this supernatural vision of God is heaven, is salvation. To fall short of it is hell, is perdition. This is the main and essential idea of hell, whatever other pains may be incidental to that state. When in discussion we lose sight of this cardinal idea, we only "darken wisdom by words without knowledge." And now, to enforce and impress this as the only essential and constitutent idea of hell, let me illustrate.

Suppose that one of our race in the world to come should find himself deprived of the vision of God, and therefore of that supernatural bliss which constitutes heaven. Suppose, however, that he should still be happy thus far, namely, should be free from every species of physical pain, and should enjoy a happiness which, although confined to the natural reach of his faculties, should nevertheless be perfect and complete in its kind, and far beyond any thing which this present world can afford. And, finally, suppose that this happiness should be confirmed to him forever. Would this be heaven, or any thing like it? No. *It would still be hell.* It would be a lost destiny. And yet it would be a greater felicity than the most progressive infidel has ever dreamed of. Such a state could not argue cruelty on the part of God, unless infidel doctrine be confessed as still more cruel.—Pp. 48–50.

Of course, it is very different with those who are not innocent of actual sin. They incur something more than this penalty of a lost destiny. In proportion to the degree of their sinfulness they deprive themselves also of natural happiness, and incur positive punishment. Since, moreover, man is a mixed being, composed of soul and body, (both pertaining to the integrity of his nature, and both taking part in sin,) both must share also in the punishment.—Pp. 51, 52.

To Mr. Burr's hope that Mr. Walworth will concede some salvation to him, based on works, the latter replies:

I would joyfully embrace you, also, if your good works were what we mean in theology by good works, namely, good works proceeding from divine charity, or the love of God above all things. But this can only proceed from a supernatural and living faith.—Pp. 36.

How liberal he can be to even infidels he thus states:

I am, however, no bigot, but ready to acknowledge all good wherever I find it. I can recognize good qualities in infidels—qualities which are good by natural endowment and by cultivation, although not elevated to a supernatural platform, and

made divine by grace. I can recognize in them noble dispositions, amiable and attractive traits of character, and love them therefor. Do you suppose, for instance, that I do not admire, that I see nothing good in, such men as Agassiz and Emerson? These may both be called infidels, and, I trust, without offense. I understand the first to deny all revealed religion, although he recognizes the creating hand of God in nature, and speaks of it with an accuracy of conception and a beauty of expression that no clergyman can surpass. The other, a pantheist, speaks often enough of God, though what he takes for God is but the divine shadow. And yet so deeply philosophical is his mind, and in his study of nature he is so keenly conscious of a living breath behind the canvas, that he seems to me like a blindfolded genius groping after God, and only failing to grasp him when his hands are just upon him. I can adopt many of his verses to express some of the grandest truths in Catholic theology.—Pp. 36, 37.

But he does not quite admit infidels, apparently, into the benign hell, above described, of the innocents. Mr. Burr finally concludes that the "Investigator" is about satiated, gives Mr. Walworth the last word, and the discussionists, "papist" and "infidel," part, honorably to both, with terms of mutual courtesy. We could have willingly read a bigger book.

The accomplished priest was clearly master of the field, and presented the Roman theology in its most favorable lights. In some of the aspects of theology Rome was preferable to Geneva, and Trent to Dort. The Pope tried to let think on predestination; but Gomarus and his set put on the screws. Gomarus was fiercely angry when one day at Leyden he heard Arminius debate with a papist and come to large agreements. At successive periods Leibnitz and Grotius discussed with papal doctors the reunion of Christendom, and large concessions were offered; but in both cases Rome ended the discussion by refusing to concede a jot of the Creed of Trent. At the present day the impossibilities are trebled. Trent still remains; and then the dogma of the Pope's infallibility has hardened Romanism into an absolute despotism; and that despotism is made bloody by the persistent assertion to the last of the right of bodily infliction for heresy. Priest Walworth talks a smooth liberalism for even Emerson; but even he must maintain the right to subject Emerson to the rack for "crime in the order of ideas."

Calvinism: An Address delivered at St. Andrew's, March 17, 1871. By James Anthony Froude, M.A., Rector of the University, Author of "History of England," etc. 12mo., pp. 45. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

A perusal of this *jeu d'esprit*, in consequence of the gratulation of some of our gravest Calvinistic authorities over its contents, induces us to realize that our Calvinistic brethren are generously grateful for small and doubtful favors. "God sends us Gospel, and the devil sends us theology," was whilom Mr. Froude's maxim; and

his present jaunty purpose is to exemplify how smartly he can show how good a thing the devil has sent us in the most theological of theologies. Calvinism is an outrage upon natural reason and feelings; Calvinism is going rapidly to the dogs; but Calvinism is accordant with facts, and Calvinism is and has been parent of all the noblest virtues exemplified in all the noblest characters of human history. And if these are paradoxes most wonderful, more wonderful still are my genius and liberality in concocting them, and most wonderful of all would be the easy versatility by which I could at pleasure reverse the whole story, and elaborate an opposite statement, in my next *Exercitatio Academica*, at, perhaps, Harvard College.

The following paragraph at start corroborates on a most extended scale the sharp statement of our friend "The Methodist," that Calvinism is running into the "effete:"

"Every one here present must have become familiar in late years with the change of tone throughout Europe and America on the subject of Calvinism. After being accepted for two centuries in all Protestant countries as the final account of the relations between man and his Maker, it has come to be regarded by liberal thinkers as a system of belief incredible in itself, dishonoring to its object, and as intolerable as it has been itself intolerant. The Catholics whom it overthrew take courage from the philosophers, and assail it on the same ground."—P. 4. But surely the historian is quite unhistorical in saying that "Calvinism has been accepted for two centuries in all Protestant countries." Certainly, for two centuries England has rejected it; and Lutheranism in Germany has some rights to a mention in history. Under Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin predestination did at start acquire a predominance in Protestantism such as it never before nor since possessed in any great section of the Christian Church, however predominant in the Mohammedan. It became strongly intrenched in the national creeds. But in most signal instances the second sober thought resulted in reaction, and from that time to this the belief and the creeds have been gradually bidding each other good-bye.

Mr. Froude affirms, as often is affirmed at the present day, that we cannot deny that Calvinism accords with the *facts*. Arbitrary inequalities and rank injustices do exist in the world. If we listen not merely to our subjective feelings, but to the story of facts inductively studied, they will preach us Calvinism. Then, we reply, The preaching is falsehood. The "facts" are villainous liars. They libel God. They are blasphemers; for they im-

peach his Rectitude. A true theology which shall "vindicate the ways of God to man" does not legitimatize and eternize these "facts," but will show how the "up-clearing" of judgment and eternity will reverse the story, and give these lying "facts" the lie. Assuming, with the Calvinist, that the story of these "facts" is ultimate, the Atheist denies that there is any God; the Manichean affirms that there is a God half good and half bad; the Pessimist declares that existence is a curse, and the Buddhist that the highest of all attainments is Nirvana. The Arminian refuses to take these facts as ultimate. Those "subjective feelings," which Calvinism requires us to silence, Arminianism holds to be holy intuitions, the virtual voice of God within us asserting the divine Rectitude. It admits that "*this* world" (with a powerful emphasis on *this*) "was made for Cesar," and that Satan is god of this æon. But its eye of divine faith, in accord with the faith of all the faithful of old, looks to the day of Rectification, when the world and all the "facts" that are therein "shall be burned up." The very difference between a world of probation and a world of retribution is, that in the latter the Cesarisms and Satanisms are not perpetuated, but rectified and made subservient to a grand Reversal.

As to the monopoly of nobleness of character by Calvinism, it depends much on the list you please to draw up. It will be a small catalogue in human history that owes its luster to its Calvinism. Of all countries in Europe, perhaps, England has given the two opposing isms fairest play, and how meager a showing is made by Calvinism! What share had Calvinism in her very highest line of names, as Shakspeare, Milton, Bacon, Locke, Newton, Butler, and Wesley, or in Marlborough, Chatham, Franklin, Washington, and Wellington? The very fact that, starting with the predominance at the Reformation in the noblest nation of Europe, she was dispossessed, worsted, and outlawed, doing her greatest good mainly as an unsuccessful revolter, yet leaving England still the noblest nation of Europe, is decisive proof of her failure as a predominant good in history.

Literature and Dogma, an Essay Toward a Better Apprehension of the Bible. By MATTHEW ARNOLD, D.C.L., formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford and Fellow of Oriel College. 12mo., pp. 316. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1873.

Mr. Arnold in the present volume endeavors to preserve the old Hebrew and Greek books of Scripture by infusing into them

the dogmas of Carlylian pantheism. This work he performs as demanded by the advanced "culture" of the age, the spirit of modern "literature." The old interpretations on which the Church has lived are, by a revolution that never can go back, obsolete. The grand old Bible lies on a shore whence the ebbing tide has left it, stranded; and the only way to enable it to float proudly on the topmost wave of the future is to give it a new pantheistic rig and ballast and launch it anew. Bravo! But with us there are grave difficulties in the way of the new rig. We do not see how the God of the Bible, or of the universe, is one whit improved by being deprived of his Personality. The universal heart of man in the instinct and act of *prayer* demands a Personal Being to pray to. Rob God of his personality, and you silence worship and extinguish all the power of devotion out of which religion is made. In the next place no honest interpretation of the biblical books can read the Divine Personality out of them. Mr. Arnold's book simply makes this public proposition: Let us all agree in a compact to save the Bible by willfully seeing in it what our plain senses know is not there. This is a grand invention to resuscitate our dying faith! For this new invention Mr. Arnold need take out no patent to secure himself an absolute monopoly. In the glow of its newness and the fervor of composition, he may fancy, for the time, that he himself believes it. But as time reveals to him the fact that nobody else does, he will discover that in reality he has never himself believed it. He has only proposed that it be adopted into a public make-believe by an act of general self-magnetizing deception.

The great error of writers like Mr. Arnold is that their own hearts have never been touched with the deep saving faith of the Gospel, and their vainly seeking an artificial substitute. Their want of vital faith results in a growing declension of theoretic faith, and they fancy that the decay of faith in their own souls is identical with the departure of faith from the world. And in their world—the little world of their association, reading, and thought—faith *is* decaying. It is equally true that much of the "systematic theology" of the Middle Ages is retreating into the shades, and we are returning to the simpler faith of the martyr age. That pure primitive religion is not decaying. It will stand while the world stands. It dreads no Huxleys, Spencers, Somersets, or Greggs; and it needs no Arnolds. The pledge for its undying power is Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

It is curious to note how the different authors brought under a reviewer's reading within the same few days are brought under each other's reflected light. We have in mind brought the Duke of Somerset, Gregg's Enigmas of Life, and Arnold's book, into spontaneous comparison with Hodge's Theology; and how stand they related? As the floating vapor to the solid rock. Somerset rejects Revelation, and falls back in firm faith upon pure deism. Gregg doubts of God and rests in simple philanthropism. Arnold rejects the Divine Personality, and reads an earnestly ethical pantheism into the Bible. The sturdy Theologian bases himself on the Bible, as read by the firmest faith of the ages, and, making all deductions for special error, he stands in the stern self-possession of assured truth, while the others are fidgetty, nervous, and consciously ephemeral. The whole reminds us of the lines

> Night wanes; the mists around the mountain curled
> Melt into morn, and light awakes the world.

Hodge is the mountain, the flippant trio are the mists; as the morning-dawn of truth advances, the mists are dissipated into their true nothingness, and the eternal mountain dwells in the light of the eternal Sun.

The Ingham Lectures. A Course of Lectures on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, delivered before the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio. 12mo., pp. 365. Cleveland: Ingham, Clarke, & Co. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

A few years ago William A. Ingham, Esq., of Cleveland, Ohio, placed in the hands of the Faculty of the Ohio Wesleyan University a sum of money to be expended in securing the delivery before the University of a course of Lectures on the "Evidences of Religion." In accordance with the wise design of the founder, and as the result of the provision made, the lecturers were named, their several themes assigned them, and the ten lectures which constitute the volume were delivered.

Of these lectures Dr. R. S. Foster, now a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, delivered three: one on "Personal Cause," another on "Huxley's Theory of the Origin of Life," and a third on "Darwin's Theory Concerning the Origin of Species." The Rev. Dr. Mahan, President of Adrian College, lectured on "Theism and Antitheism in their Relations to Science." Bishop Thomson lectured on "Miracles." Bishop Clark lectured on the theme, "The Bible a Revelation from God." Dr. William F. Warren, of Boston University, discussed "Scripture Inspiration." Dr. F. H. Newhall, of the Wesleyan University, Conn., examined the "Alleged Dis

crepancies of Scripture." Dr. D. Curry, Editor of the "Christian Advocate," showed the "Adaptation of the Scriptures to Man's Moral and Spiritual Nature." Dr. William D. Godman, President of Baldwin University, Ohio, delivered a lecture on "The Person of Jesus Christ."

The bare recital of these distinguished names, and the lofty themes which were chosen for them, will at once command respect and attention. Christianity has had its assailants in every age. The idea of a personal God, a divine, revealed law, and human accountability, are doctrines which fallen human nature will not admit without a contest. Sometimes the foe silently digs at the foundations of the Church; sometimes he marches boldly up to assault the walls of the fortress; sometimes he puts on a meek and pious look, and offers to submit to be called a Christian, provided the Church will allow him to interpret her doctrines and reconstruct her code of morals in his own "liberal" way. In the last few years the prevalent phase has been the "oppositions of science, falsely so called." In this volume of lectures the enemy is well and ably met at the chief points of latter-day assault. Each of the great themes enumerated is discussed by the hand of a master. We commend the book to all thoughtful minds, to whom time is precious, and who, nevertheless, desire to know the direction and strength of current discussions. C.

The Wise Men: Who They Were, and How They Came to Jerusalem. By FRANCIS W. UPHAM, LL.D., Professor of Mental Philosophy in Rutger's Female College. 12mo., pp. 253. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

This is a new, improved, and enlarged edition of this remarkable work. When first issued from the press, in 1869, it attracted the attention of our best scholars—Tayler Lewis, Howard Crosby, and others—as one of the most striking contributions to sacred literature of the present day.

There is no passage in the New Testament that reads so like a myth, and appears so completely air-hung, and severed from all connections with any other earthly thing, as the brief narrative of the Magi and the star. The elaborate failures of Kepler and Ideler to solve the difficulties from the sphere of astronomy had rather deepened than diminished the mystery. Infidels always quoted it as one of their strong points, rationalizing scholars endeavored to get rid of it as an interpolation, and even orthodox divines often accepted it as one of the perplexing tasks upon their faith. Dean Trench wrote a fine essay upon it, palpably advancing its

exposition. But, without being in the least degree indebted to Trench, Dr. Upham, with affluent learning and singular skill, has brought an immense number of items from various sources of modern discovery to bear upon the passage. Under the light of his discussions difficulties are removed, accordances with geography and history are discovered, and beautiful lessons of truth and sacred veracity are deduced. The whole is done in a style that fascinates even the popular reader. The biblical scholar and the preacher will find in it a theme for thought and attractive pulpit illustration. In the department of Christian evidences it is a new and permanent gain.

Evidences of Revealed Religion. By EDWARD THOMSON, D.D., LL.D., late a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo., pp. 327. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872.

The thirteen lectures which compose this volume were delivered before the Theological School of the Boston University but a short time before the lamented death of the author. They were also delivered at Evanston, and in both places made a deep impression. The subjects discussed are "God," "Spirituality," "Immortality," "The Moral Government of God," "Life a Probation," "Future Punishment," "Necessity of the Gospel," "Advantages of the Gospel," "Christ our Prophet, our Priest, our King," "Miracles," "Objections to the Cross."

The title of the book is not a very accurate description of the contents. Some of these lectures do, indeed, grapple in a strong, manly way with the subtlest questions which infidelity has propounded for discussion. This part of the work must have been especially instructive and grateful to the young and eager minds to which the Bishop addressed his golden words. Others are simply fervid Gospel sermons, glowing exhibitions of revealed verities, divine truths asserted on divine authority—"the mouth of the Lord hath spoken." Rich with the very marrow of the Scripture, full of thought, adorned and illuminated with apt illustration, clear and graceful in style, these lectures are worthy to be studied as models of good thinking and good writing.

Studies of Character from the Old Testament. By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 436. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1872.

The author singles out sixteen of the notable men and women of the olden time, and portrays them, each under the title suggested by his or her most striking feature of character or con-

duct. Thus, for example, he names and describes Abraham the Friend of God, Moses the Patriot, and Rehoboam the Foolish Man. Eliezer, Joseph, Joshua, Caleb, Boaz, Ruth, Gideon, Hannah, Samuel, Jonathan, David, Solomon, and Jehu complete the list. The methods of Dr. Guthrie are too well known to need description. Here we have the same facile pen, the same leisurely approach toward his subject, which we have noted so often. The author is never in a hurry, never seems to fear that his theme will get away from him; has no apprehension that his ideas will fly away, like a new swarm of bees, unless they are hived on the instant; no suspicion that the reader may grow impatient of his winding paths, and cut across lots to the point of interest. The volume before us shows the same clear, vigorous style, the same wealth and pertinency of illustration, and the same devout, religious spirit, with which the other works coming from the same prolific mind have made us familiar. This is equal in interest and value to any of its predecessors, which is no small praise.

Sermons by Rev. C. D. N. Campbell, D.D. 12mo., pp. 348. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press.

In this volume we have twenty-four sermons from the pen of an able minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. They were evidently prepared with care, finished to the ultimate. The selection of topics is good. "Christ," "Holiness," "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Goodness," and "Human Accountability," are the grand themes which he discusses clearly and strongly, speaking "as one having authority," enforcing what God has revealed, instead of groping in vain search after what we may not know now.

This fearless reliance on the truth is worthy of universal imitation. Apologetic theology has its place, no doubt, but it may be overdone. The preacher who is always acting on the defense invites attack, and inspires his adversaries with courage to make assault. The style is ornate, and at times even florid, but always clear and forcible.

The Providence of God. Viewed in the Light of Holy Scripture. By THOMAS JACKSON. 12mo., pp. 420. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1866.

The venerable Thomas Jackson, who lately passed to his eternal reward, was for long years a standard writer with English Methodists. He was author of the Life of Robert Newton, of Charles Wesley, and of Richard Watson. From his pen came the Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism, and other works of denomina-

tional authority. He was master of a grave, clear, and manly style of very pure English. Nothing eccentric, sensational, or "brilliant" ever came from his pen. His personal and ministerial character commanded a profound reverence beyond the boundaries of Wesleyanism.

The present volume, which has reached a second edition, discusses the nature of Providence solely as it presents itself in the Holy Scriptures. It is a biblical survey of the Divine Government. It draws upon the fine old authors, Flavel, Crane, Charnock, and Sherlock. It is written, of course, from the Wesleyan-Arminian stand-point, and is a very clear and masterly exhibit of the Scripture doctrine.

The Gospel According to Matthew. Together with a General Theological and Homiletical Introduction to the New Testament. By JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn. Translated from the Third German Edition. With Additions, Original and Selected, by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. Twelfth Edition, Revised. 8vo., pp. 568. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

A Commentary, Critical, Expository, and Practical, on the Gospel of Matthew. For the Use of Bible-classes and Sabbath-schools. By JOHN J. OWEN, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 415. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

The Gospel According to Matthew. Explained by JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER. 12mo., pp. 456. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

These are Commentaries of standard value for ministers, laymen, Bible-class, and Sunday-school. They serve to illustrate the richness of our literature in this department, and to evince that the Bible is not a "sick" or dying "man."

Universalism not of the Bible. By Rev. N. D. GEORGE. 12mo., pp. 461. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

A new and improved edition of a work which has done good service in defense of the doctrine of the Church on the most solemn of topics. The author is a natural logician, is master of his subject, and has clothed his argument in a clear, trenchant, and popular style. It is a book "for the people."

Introduction and Analysis of the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews and of the Book of Revelation. By Prof. JAMES STRONG, D.D. 8vo., pp. 342. New York: Poole & MacLauchlan. 1872.

An extended and acute outline of the plan of these Epistles, prepared by the Professor for the use of his classes. An elaborate commentary on this Book from the pre-Augustinian stand-point is a desideratum, of which we trust that this analysis indicates a future supply.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Predigten von Richard Rothe, eine Nachlese. (Supplementary Sermons.) Hamburg. 1872.

This volume, though complementive of the three volumes already edited by Dr. Schenkel, is an independent publication, and affords, in one respect, a truer reflection of how Rothe really preached than the other volumes. Dr. Schenkel took the liberty not only of polishing up literarily, but also of dogmatically modifying some of the earlier sermons, so as to make them harmonize with the author's presumed defection from orthodoxy; whereas these thirty-five supplementary ones are given as nearly as possible in the very words spoken or written by Rothe himself. But even here the authenticity is not absolute, for the volume was printed, for the most part, not from original but from second-hand copies, which had been made by a pious lady, not in view of publication but of personal edification. Most of them were delivered during the culminative productive years of the author, (1839–55,) when he was elaborating his great work on Ethics. We naturally expected, therefore, to find them stamped with strong peculiarities, and we were not disappointed. We have read a good part of them with profit and delight. They occasionally astonish the reader with dogmatic eccentricities, but their most marked and redeeming trait is their all-persuasive earnestness and suavity of Christian love. In form they are all exceedingly simple and practical, aiming to bring the central Christian doctrines into vital relation to daily life.

Of the doctrinal peculiarities in these sermons we will cite only two. The first relates to the person of Christ. In discoursing on the Passion, Rothe says:

> It was only through his death that Jesus could truly develop himself as the Son of God, and manifest himself to the world. It was only thereby that the object itself of his testimony, namely, his unity with the Father, could attain to its full reality. Jesus himself had to be perfected by suffering. Only by a perfect surrender of all that was his own to God, and thereby also to man, could he be entirely God's, and himself entirely possess God. Only when with his innermost powers he merged himself into the Godhead was he, as man, entirely seized upon by the divine life. For this very reason, the death of the Redeemer was essentially, at the same time, his resurrection, his defeat also directly his unconditional victory over the world, so that now and thenceforth there was nothing in him that was merely human, but every thing was also divine; only now could he witness of his unconditional unity with God, *for it was only now that he had it.*

The second point relates to Rothe's view, that the actual Christianity of the world is more comprehensive than any or all of the organized Christian Churches, and that the Church is in process

of vanishing into the State. In a sermon on the proper love to one's own Church, he rejoices that the ecclesiastical

> Dam is broken down for the outflow of the great stream of Christian life; that the Church decreases in that Christ increases. . . . We have Christianity also outside of the Church, and not merely in it; in fact, it blooms in some respects more joyously and luxuriantly in the great garden of God around the Church, than within its walls; let us frankly recognize it, the great wide labor-field, which no *one* Church alone is capable of cultivating, but for which all Churches should reach to each other the hand.

But these detached passages need to be modified by their contexts, otherwise they are liable to be taken in a sense not intended by the author.

Die Idealen Seiten des Katholicismus. Vortrag Von H. V. D. Goltz, Professor in Basel. Gotha. 1872.

Why does the Catholic Church, notwithstanding its fall from spiritual Christianity and its implication in many degrading superstitions, still maintain so large a control of the consciences of men? The Protestant is accustomed to attribute it to various circumstances—to the prestige of age and the force of habit, to an alliance with the reactionary conservatism of modern politics, to the thorough organization and administrative skill of the clergy, and to the accommodating flexibility of the Jesuits. But Professor Goltz, who has long studied the question in the midst of Romanism, and even at Rome itself, regards these answers as only partially adequate, and finds a principal factor of the answer in the more thorough Catholic conception of the Church as the body of Christ. But there is error on both sides. The Protestant tends to sacrifice the Church to the individual; the Catholic, the individual to the Church. But all Protestants are not equally guilty of individualistic one-sidedness. The author cites with special prominence the potent workings of the *esprit de corps* of Methodism in England and America. He looks upon the present ultramontane paroxysm of Romanism as an abnormal state of eclipse, and hopes that the contemporary materialistic assault on Christianity in general will serve not only to draw all Protestants into closer relations to each other, but also to drive Catholicism to a more spiritual conception of Christianity. When the two Churches shall have thrown off their defects—the Protestant, its negative; the Catholic, its positive—they will find that they stand nearer to each other than they are wont to think; and even as they now are, they might learn useful lessons from each other. So thinks Professor Goltz.

Stille Stunden: Aphorismen aus Richard Rothe's Handschriftlichem Nachlass. (Aphorisms from the Posthumous Papers of Dr. Rothe.) Wittenberg. 1872.

The friends of Rothe venerate his memory as that of an almost saint. The veriest fragments from his pen are being gathered and digested for the press. This neat volume of *Quiet Hours* (pp. 378) consists of pointed laconic observations, from a single line to half a page long, made by Rothe, during a long series of years, while engaged in that course of intense thought-life which resulted in his magnificent system of theosophic ethics. The editor, Professor Nippold, has judiciously omitted such of the aphorisms as repeated each other, or were unadapted for general reading, and has digested the remainder under the twelve general heads: "Personal," "Principles of Speculation," "Of God," "God *vs.* World," "Of Man," "Of Christ," "The Christian Life," "Christian Society," "On Church History," "On Politics," "Culture," "Churchianity *vs.* Christianity."

A few of the sayings are merely playful or humorous or autobiographical, but the large majority are abstruse and speculative. All of them, however, are intelligible; for no matter how far or high Rothe soared, he was careful not to become muddy. The doctrines involved in the aphorisms are, in the main, evangelical; especially is the autonomy of the will cogently put; but there crop out, here and there, some of the unchurchly views of Rothe, for example, as to the ultimate disappearance of the Church in the State, and as to a physical necessity that human development pass through the stage of sin.

The book, as a whole, is a very good one to have always at hand; not to read consecutively, but to glance into at odd moments, or when our thought-machinery grows sluggish. Often there is stimulation enough within a half dozen lines to send one for hours into regions of unwonted, and even venturesome, speculation.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Half-Hour Recreations in Popular Science. Part VI. Unconscious Action of the Brain and Epidemic Delusions. By Dr. W. B. CARPENTER, F.R.S., Author of "Human Physiology," etc. 12mo., pp. 63. Boston: Estes & Lauriat.

Why not Unconscious action of the *mind?* We have lately encountered, in certain quarters, the new-fangled phrase, "unconscious cerebration." Now "cerebration" is derived from *cerebrum*, a brain; and it presupposes a possible verb, "to cerebrate." Why

not "*mentalization*" as well? What does this new vocable indicate, unless it is intended to embrace in itself the theory that the brain structure, by mere mechanical force, *cerebrates*, or evolves, the *result* of a ratiocination without thoughtor mind; just as Mr. Babbage's calculating machine ground out an arithmetical result? Neither Dr. Carpenter, nor any other writer, that we have seen, has made it clear whether he means this or not.

Now we can easily conceive that in a fixed process, like an arithmetical calculation, an unconscious, unthinking, mindless machine may bring out a due result. But when it comes, for instance, to a complicated law case, such as Dr. C. narrates, embracing references to an immense number of contingent facts requiring original invention and a wide variety of incalculable items, the idea of a mechanical, material machine bringing out an extended and masterly legal argument is about as probable as that Homer's Iliad was composed by an infinite number of letters fortuitously tumbling into line.

There are, indeed, many processes of our physical system that move, like the water-wheel under the stream, automatically; that is, as a step in a series of causes and effect. The process of digestion is carried on by an agency as little mental as the shrinking of a sensitive plant to the touch of the hand. These processes of unconscious automatic vitality are carried on primordially, we suppose, by the omnipotent power, which

> Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
> Spreads undivided, operates unspent.

On the contrary, whatever Dr. Carpenter may say, the process of *winking* is never without the intervention of *mind*. This is always a *sensitive* action; and *sensitivity*, however minute, is mentality. There is always, also, a volitional action, and a volition is a mentality. It is very loosely said that we wink "without thinking," "unconsciously," or *purely* "automatically." We always wink to relieve a minute uneasiness, and that uneasiness has a mental quality in it. And so of the processes of walking, dressing, etc., we believe that it is very incorrect to call them automatic in a sense that denies to them perception and volition.

Sir William Hamilton calculates that the mind can think of about six different things at the same time. Of these six, one or more are often so infinitesimal that they are *instantly forgotten*. The pain that demands the wink, and the volition by which it is performed, are of this class. So are the volitions by which a rapid accountant casts up a long column of figures; as well as the per-

ception by which the shape of each figure is recognized; and the thought by which its value is identified; and the other thought by which the amount of each successive figure is added in; all these mentalities occurring at each figure of the column. Similar is the process by which the rapid speaker, while thinking of his subject, and caring for any number of external objects, selects the spontaneous words of an extended extemporaneous speech. If you mean by "unconscious" or "automatic" that all these were not so many thought-processes, or mental acts, you commit an abdication of that "common sense" so eulogized by Dr. Carpenter at the commencement of his Lecture. And yet the moment the column of figures is footed, every individual mental step in the process is as completely forgotten as is every wink that was enacted while the process was performed. If you mean by *consciousness* the proper *being* of the thought, then every step in the process was a conscious one. And it was no more "automatic" than thousands of other volitional processes of much larger size or slower performance. It seems to us just as sensible to say that the figures were added automatically, in the sense of non-mentally, as to say with Dr. Carpenter that a man "walks automatically." What he calls an "unconscious action of the brain" we hold to be a conscious action of the mind. The main error with our physiological brethren here is the identifying automatic with unconscious or non-mental. There is many an automatic conscious volition. Dr. Bledsoe, in his unfortunate review of our work on the Will, did indeed very inadvertently say that in admitting unfree, necessitated, or automatic volition to be possible, we "gave up the whole question" of volitional freedom. But nothing is more common than a "Hobson's choice," where there is only one thing to choose, and no liberty to not choose, or to choose otherwise. Thereby it generally ceases to be responsible, but does not cease to be a volition. And so the physiologist has not proved that an act is either "unconscious" or purely *cerebral* when he has shown it to be automatic. In sudden surprises and shocks of mind, in instantaneous exigencies, where action has but one course, in instinctive movements, and in neutralizing minute irritations, there are myriads of volitions that are unavoidable and automatic yet infinitesimally conscious, and as instantly forgotten as if they had never been. It would save our physiological friends very many exposures of ignorance if they would undergo a competent drill in psychology.

Like every scientific solution of supernatural phenomena we

have seen, Dr. Carpenter's Lecture may be divided into three parts. The first part is probable truth and successful solution; the second part is inferential and possibly true solution; the third part is failure and charlatanry, with unscientific and bitter denunciation upon all who decline their solutions, as a set of bigots and ignoramuses. We have in a former Quarterly referred to the fact that our scientific solvers of supernaturalistic phenomena give us solutions that cover but part of the facts. Take the following illustration from this lecture:

> A gentleman who put a question to one of these tables got an extremely curious answer, which affords a very remarkable illustration of the principle I was developing to you in the last lecture—the unconscious action of the brain. He had been studying the life of Edward Young the poet, or at least had been thinking of writing it, and the spirit of Edward Young announced himself one evening as he was sitting with his sister-in-law. Edward Young announced himself by the raps, spelling out the words in accordance with the directions that the table received. He asked, "Are you Young the poet?" "Yes." "The author of the 'Night Thoughts?'" "Yes." "If you are, repeat a line of his poetry." And the table spelled out, according to the system of telegraphy which had been agreed upon, this line:
>
> "Man is not formed to question but adore."
>
> He said, "Is this in the 'Night Thoughts?'" "No." "Where is it?" "J O B." He could not tell what this meant. He went home, bought a copy of Young's works, and found that in the volume containing Young's poems there was a poetical commentary on Job which ended with that line. He was extremely puzzled at this; but two or three weeks afterward he found that he had a copy of Young's works in his own library, and was satisfied from marks in it that he had read that poem before. I have no doubt whatever that that line had remained in his mind, that is, in the lower stratum of it; that it had been entirely forgotten by him, as even the possession of Young's poems had been forgotten; but that it had been treasured up, as it were, in some dark corner of his memory, and had come up in this manner, expressing itself in the action of the table, just as it might have come up in a dream.—Page 245.

The solution works here very admirably. But take the following parallel fact, which we translate from the German of the *Handbuch der Psychologie*, by Dr. Wilhelm Kaulich, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Gratz, and author of several works of standard character in the highest philosophy:

"In the Dream-physiology of Andre Delrieu (Revue de Paris, No. of January 13, 1839) is found the following narrative: 'An eminent scholar at Dijon, in the seventeenth century, laid himself upon his bed, wearied, because he was unable to understand the meaning of a passage in a Greek poet, and went to sleep. Suddenly he was transferred in spirit to the palace of Queen Christine, of Sweden, was borne into the library, and stood before a certain alcove, in which his eyes fell upon a certain separate volume, the title of which seemed new to him. He opened

the volume and found therein the solution of the whole difficulty! The ecstasy of the scholar over the discovery awakened him. Des Cartes, the philosopher, was at that time in Stockholm. Our scholar wrote to Chanute, the French embassador in Sweden, and requested him to ask of his friend, the great philosopher, how the palace and library of the Queen were built, and whether, in a certain alcove, on a certain page of the named volume, could be found a certain Greek verse, of which the scholar furnished a copy. Des Cartes responded to the embassador; the alcove, the volume, the verse, all were there.' "—P. 307.

Now it will at once be seen that Dr. Carpenter's "unconscious action of the brain," "unconscious cerebration," and "dark corner of memory," with all his elaborate theories, from beginning to end, fail here. There are entire classes of cases in which they are equally failures. Dr. Kaulich has a few chapters on this whole subject, compared with which Carpenter's utterances appear to us very much like twaddle.

These views, however, do not nullify the force of Dr. Carpenter's application of his theories to the refutation of the claims of "Table Turning." Even if the act by which the table is turned by the hand is automatic, it is still mental and conscious, though infinitesimal and escaping the memory. So far as we have investigated, we see no need of introducing the term "cerebration" into language. We may add, that we do not recollect that Dr. Carpenter has used it in this present lecture.

Year-Book of Nature and Popular Science for 1872. Edited by JOHN C. DRAPER, M.D., Professor of Natural History and Physiology in the College of the City of New York, and of Chemistry in the University Medical College. 12mo., pp. 333. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

Annual Record of Science and Industry. Edited by SPENCER F. BAIRD. With the Assistance of Eminent Men of Science. 12mo., pp. 651. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

Annuals recording the progress and regulations of science during the year are of great value to the non-savants who are interested in these subjects. Of the above two, Dr. Baird's deals more largely in the practical departments, but Prof. Draper's is richest in the biological. There is a large class of students to whom, as psychologists, archæologists, biblicists, and theologians, the last of these departments possesses the main interest.

In Prof. Draper's hands, however, this department is one-sided and decidedly stale. Extended extracts are given from the sophomoric rhetorics of Maudesley which are not science, but polemics. The very passages given were discussed in our Quarterly

Book-table three years ago! Dr. M'Cosh said in 1871, with severe truth, that Maudesley was too ignorant of mental science, as was shown by his blunders, to pass a college examination in that department. Dr. Draper shows the same ignorance by quoting one of the very passages by which this remark was justified, containing an attribution of a doctrine to metaphysicians which no respectable metaphysician holds. This ignorance, arising usually from education in a single department only, so customary and so advocated among materialistic educationists, would be excusable if it were not so dogmatical. It assumes, as the Chinaman once did, that all outside its own "flowery land" is barbarian.

Like Maudesley and Louis Büchner, Prof. Draper reprobates the exaltation of mind over matter. This point we fully discussed on the first appearance of Maudesley's and Büchner's works in this country, and it is dismal to see these stale scraps here reproduced to us as—*science!* They are simply a *nescience*, fabricated in the interests of Atheism. Can Dr. Draper tell us of what value matter is, tried by any conceivable standard, except as it is subservient to mind? If a mass of matter contributed in no respect whatever, mediate or immediate, to the welfare or pleasure of a sentient being, might it not just as well be so much pure space? If immensity of space were completely filled with matter, with not a spark of mind existent, would this infinity of matter possess any superiority over an infinity of pure space? If in that immensity of matter there existed one intelligent being, capable of happiness and misery, would not that entire mass be valuable or worthless as it contributed to his happiness? To all this there can be but one reasonable reply; and that reply declares that this doctrine of Büchner, Maudesley, and Draper is unentitled to any man's moral or intellectual respect. We do Prof. Draper the justice to add that, besides the trite scraps from Maudesley, he gives us one from Tyndall, equally trite, which is not in the interest of materialism, and for which we would have thanked him had it been its first appearance and not its half dozenth.

The following paragraphs of *science* are, however, worth insertion:

> Automatic Life.—If a drop of acetic acid is placed on the under surface of the thigh of a decapitated frog, the animal will rub it off with the back surface of the foot of the same side. If that foot is cut off, the animal makes attempts to remove the drop of acid, but as it cannot, it soon ceases its endeavors, becomes restless, and finally rubs it off with the foot of the other side.
>
> How are we to explain these puzzling phenomena? Can they be mental? The period of restlessness, the final use of the foot of the opposite side, certainly appear to favor the idea that the spinal cord possesses the power of sensation and volition in

common with the brain, and some physiologists are inclined to accept such an hypothesis. To others, however, these movements that prevent the semblance of consciousness and volition are in reality entirely automatic or reflex, and are similar to such acts as coughing and sneezing. The vain endeavor to use the lost foot of the same side is in itself an evidence of the want of mental power, and the final use of the foot of the opposite side is merely an extension of the impression to the opposite side of the spinal cord.

Viewed in a proper manner, the majority of the movements of our own daily life are automatic in their character. The act of walking, for example, when it is once initiated by an effort of will, goes on of itself without our giving it a thought; innumerable familiar operations, as dressing and undressing, are in reality automatic; having commenced them, they are continued mechanically, while the mind is occupied in some other channel; and if we endeavor to remember whether we have wound up our watch, we find that it is necessary to examine it with the key to arrive at a reliable conclusion.—Pp. 210, 211.

That the acts of walking, dressing, undressing, sneezing, coughing, winking are not "automatic" in that sense of the term which excludes mentality, sensation, preception, volition, we have tried to show in our notice of Dr. Carpenter's Lecture. The act of the frog is, we think, also sensitive and volitional. The very term "makes attempts" indicates this; and the selection of another method after the first has failed is clearly a selective and voluntary act. At any rate the trichotomist in psychology would see no difficulty in such a supposition. He believes that the animal *psyche* is of a lower nature than the *pneuma* or *spirit*, and that the former may perhaps show traces of existing in the frame after the latter, the residence of the immortality, has departed; as a snake's tail is alive some time after its head has been bruised to death.

Two or three actual SKELETONS OF THE GEOLOGIC MAN are reported as discovered. One in France, Laugerie Basse, County of Dordogne, was found in a cave, buried "about twelve feet below the surface of the earth of the Reindeer period," (a period when the climate of France was inhabitable by the Lapland quadruped,) "beneath a layer of rocks, which, during the whole pre-quaternary period, must have resisted every attempt to remove them, so that there can be no doubt as to the great antiquity of the bones."

Another in Mentone, in Italy, is thus described by Dr. J. Henry Bennet in the "Lancet:"

I saw it, he says, and carefully examined it three days after the first discovery, when it was still two thirds imbedded in the compact soil of the cave. M. Rivirèe was obliged to scrape and separate the soil from the skeleton with the utmost care. This labor took him above a week, so anxious was he to do no injury to the bones. The skeleton, that of a man above six feet in height, was in a recumbent, semi-curved position, as in sleep or repose. Death must have come suddenly during sleep or quietly during repose. There had evidently been a rude kind of inhumation, for there were some large stones behind and around the head. The

skeleton is that of a tall man, all but perfect, having no resemblance whatever to that of the orang-outang or of any monkey. The skull is elongated, very convex superiorly; teeth all present in the upper jaw, and all perfect in the lower jaw, as far as it was exposed.

The instruments found in this cavern are in bone, in deer horn, and stone, or in silex from the chalk foundation which exists in the neighborhood. Those in bone and horn are arrows, pointed instruments, needles, and implements apparently destined to flatten the threads of sewn skins. Among them was one that appears to have been a commander's baton or staff. The stone and silex instruments were found by the thousand, if fragments and scales are to be counted. Most are well preserved, and many entire. The commonest forms are scrapers. They are roughly worked, and appear to belong to the oldest known stone period.—Pp. 119, 120.

The ornaments found about the persons of these well-developed men show that they extended their travels over a considerable geographical region. It is to be noted that the perfectly human character of these specimens are a negative upon Darwinism.

On the GALAPAGOS GROUP OF ISLANDS Prof. Agassiz finds a severe problem for the Evolutionists. These islands are a late volcanic formation, belonging "almost to the present period." Yet they are endowed with a vegetation quite their own. They abound with animals elsewhere unknown, which must have sprung up on the spot or evolutionized very distantly in a very short time. They are a nut that Darwinism seems unable to crack.

WEAK OPTICS.—A suggestive and important paper by Dr. Liebreich bears upon the cause of the very prevalent tendency toward imperfection of vision in the present generation, this, in his opinion, being the result of the experiences of the school room, in having the windows improperly situated, so as to involve the introduction of light from too many directions at one time, or from an improper quarter. He recommends that such apartments be so arranged that the light shall always come from one side only, and from over the left shoulder, so that when the pen is held in the hand the shadow shall not interfere at all with drawing or writing.—*Gen. Sum.*, lxvi.

The necessity that light should come from behind, over the left shoulder for writing, and direct upon the book for reading, is a fact familiar with students of weak eyes and thoughtful heads. We have long been obliged to adjust our study-room in accordance with it. But this does not account for the weakened vision of "the present generation;" for the same neglect of the laws of vision for our school-rooms has always existed. The real cause, we suggest to our scientific brethren, gratuitously, is the intensity and heat of our gas and kerosene illuminations. Our eyes are dying from excess and sharpness of light. Personally we may say that our own eyes have been for twenty years shrinking, with increasing sensitiveness, from the blaze of gas, and its brother fire-fiend, kerosene. We are thereby exiled from the evening church, lecture-room, and even parlor and sitting-room. Our dearest friends are obliged to dispense either with the light of

our countenance or with the light of their detestable gas-pipes. As we are trying to promenade of a summer evening on our piazza, along comes the man to light up the street lamps, and our eyes say, "Hang that rascal to the lamp post." We cannot read ninety seconds by gas-light without acute pain. And yet we ordinarily do read and write from eight in the evening to half past ten. How is it done?

We have constructed a sort of lantern, by which the light of two candles is directly poured exclusively upon our page, and not into our eyes. We made it first of tin; but the heat pained our optics as much as the light, and we chose, as a non-heating material, book-board. Our candles are Mitchell's hydraulic-pressed adamantine, cut half length to bring the blaze near the page; with sundry other minor inventions. With this apparatus (we call it our *jack-o'-lantern*) our eyes ask no quarter and no repose until our whole nervous system does.

Enigmas of Life. By W. R. Gregg. 12mo., pp. 322. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1873.

Mr. Gregg is author of a book, written, some years ago, in a gentle and courteous style, with the frankly-avowed purpose of undermining the "Creeds of Christendom." His Puritanic parentage and education do, as he frankly avows, exert an influence, perhaps an illegitimate one, in causing him to retain a belief in theism and human immortality. He has no proofs for these precious items of faith which he thinks binding on any mind differently trained or constituted. Assuming these beliefs, however, as "good working hypotheses," he launches forth in an ocean of speculation as to human destiny for time and eternity. If you have leisure to humor his humor, you will find him a graceful and fluent writer and a clear thinker, but who seems to our own mind to decide very often by caprice, summarily rejecting views quite as sustainable as any he accepts.

As is often the case, he is most dogmatical where he is least informed. The Christian theology, which he most peremptorily rejects, he has evidently most slightly studied. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body, for instance, (which Dr. Maudesley, as a materialist, holds to be the only hope of immortality,) Mr. Gregg, as an antimaterialist, denounces as a childish whim. Both these writers hold Christianity responsible for the opposite dogmas they scout. Mr. Gregg's potent argument against the resurrection is the stale notion, which he advances with an air of original con-

clusiveness, that a dozen different resurrection bodies would claim the same corporeal particles. He seems never to have had the slightest intelligence that this objection has ever been answered!

Again, Mr. Gregg loftily rebukes theologians for their maintenance of an absurd notion of God's *omnipotence*. He demands, in magniloquent style: "Do divines even now in very truth attribute absolute omnipotence to the Supreme Being? Do they believe that he can combine inherent contradictions? That he can cause two and two to make five?" A man so blank of a knowledge of the A B C of Christian theology deserves slight hearing when he attacks it. Both these self-stultifications, the one on the resurrection and the other on omnipotence, occur in the few pages of Preface.

Apart from his misrepresentations of Christianity, which abound in the book, Mr. Gregg is a very suggestive writer; humanitarian, as touching man's future in this world; uniquely speculative, as to his eternity.

Christian Ethics. By Dr. ADOLF WUTTKE, late Professor of Theology at Halle. With Special Preface, by Dr. RIEHM, Editor of the "Studien und Kritiken." Translated by JOHN P. LACROIX. Two vols., 12mo. History of Ethics, pp. 378; Christian Ethics pp. 348. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

The hearty welcome which the learned critics of our higher periodicals have extended to Wüttke is doubtless gratifying to translator and publishers. Numerous as are the works on Morals in English, it is justly recognized that this work fills an unoccupied place. If it does not take position as *the* standard work, it is a contribution that cuts a notch in the progress of ethical science.

Wüttke was born in 1819 and died in 1870, so that he was taken away in his prime. His first education was at the University of his native city, Breslau, where after graduation he became Privat-docent. He was elected Extraordinary Professor of Theology in Berlin in 1854, and Professor of Theology in Halle in 1861, where he found a most congenial associate in Thöluck. The present work was published during the years 1861–65.

The first volume, the history of man as a moral thinker, is specially interesting. Tracing the course of ethical thought through the successive periods of human history, by showing how all moral systems were clearly below the level of Christianity, it becomes an argument for Christianity itself. In English ethical history, strange to say, the name of the prince of ethicists, Butler, is entirely omitted. In the second volume the essential oneness of

the *morale* of Scripture and an enlightened conscience is clearly elucidated. We shall give a full article on the work in a future Quarterly.

The first volume commences with an interesting biography of Wüttke by Prof. Riehm; the second with a fresh and vigorous introduction by Dr. Warren, of Boston University.

Four Phases of Morals; Socrates, Aristotle, Christianity, Utilitarianism. By John Stuart Blackie, F.R.S.E., Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, 12mo., pp. 354. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

The eloquent Greek Professor makes a gallant raid from his recitation-room into the open field of philosophy. Having mastered the great philosophic masters of antiquity, he makes bold to tell our modern philosophers that they might increase in wisdom by being better acquainted with their illustrious predecessors. Delivered as Lectures before the Royal Institute, London, his dissertations are expressed in a free, bold, clear, and brilliant style, and make one of the most *readable* pieces of metaphysics we have ever read.

His dissertation on Socrates is fullest and best; his Aristotle is fair; he next shows how stupendous a system of motive-forces the fact that Christianity is a *religion* inclosing a philosophy brings to energize practical ethics; his Utilitarianism is inferior to the rest, dealing more in slightly severe language than severe logic. Mr. Blackie is not a clergyman, but handles the clergy respectfully or freely as his sweet will decides. He is not emphatically *orthodox*, holding that many of the favorite tenets of Scotch Calvinism are rather exaggerations of truths than truth itself. Yet in the entire structure of unexaggerated orthodoxy he finds the most powerful synthesis of moral forces known in the history of the world. Readers who must be seduced by lively and eloquent writing into intellectual thinking will here find metaphysics made easy without being made shallow.

Pater Mundi; or, The Doctrine of Evolution. Being in substance, Lectures Delivered in Various Colleges and Theological Seminaries. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D.D. Second Series. 12mo., pp. 103. Boston: Noyes, Holmes, & Co. 1873.

Dr. Burr's successive popular publications—Ecce Cœlum, Ad Fidem, and Pater Mundi first series—are "tracts for the times." Written, as lectures, in an ornate style, they appeal to the popular taste. Publications so brief can of course give no exhaustive view of their subject; and the diffuseness of the style, though it admirably spreads the conceptions of his argument in full view

before his readers, obliges him to give only phases of the great questions. But his books deserve a wide circulation to counter act the pseudo-scientific scepticisms of the hour.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Reformation. By GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. 8vo., pp. 620. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

This beautiful volume, with its fine typography and liberal white spaces, renders history the most attractive of reading. It evinces in its author powers for placing himself among the first historians of the age. We did complain that Professor Fisher's style, besides being unsurpassable for its transparency, was a little too fluid and diffuse. But in the present volume the necessities of compression have induced a conciseness that leaves the perspicuity scarcely impaired. The arrangement is admirable; the copious analytic table of contents places the whole at command; the spirit is generally unpartisan and truthful; and with slight exceptions it seems to us about as excellent a compend of the history of the Reformation as could be made.

The picture of Calvin and Geneva are quite a test of both Dr. Fisher's historic power and historic equity. It impresses us as a marked success. There is no need of judging the great Reformer with a partisan bias. A character more clearly marked seldom appears in history. Its lights and shades, its right lines and cross lines, are drawn with unflinching fidelity. His character arouses our wonder, fastens our interest, but does not attract our love. Even to *think* of living in Geneva under his sway gives us a *dorsalgia*, and suggests a variety of other complaints. A natural born despot, his despotism was absolutely self-subjected to conscience. He was born to rule, and he was profoundly determined to rule as the impersonation of absolute rectitude. Such a ruler, when his conscience is in a state of mal-arrangement, is the very awfulest of tyrants. Who more conscientious than the "Bloody Mary" of England, or Philip II. of Spain? Calvin no more believed in the rights of the individual conscience, as Dr. Fisher plentifully shows, than either of these two rulers. The question between him and Philip was not, Ought heretics to be punished? but, Which are the heretics in order to their punishment? Had he been born heir to Charles V., both of empire and religious education, Calvin had all the qualities for dealing as bloody a schooling in

theology to the recusant Dutch Protestants as ever did Spanish Philip. His services to freedom, religious and civil, were, therefore, the result rather of position than principle.

Dr. Fisher ascribes to the early English reformers a Calvinism, not of an intenser type, but of a more exceptionless universality, than our own general reading over that field had induced us to suppose. He ranks among Calvinists Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Jewel, and Hooker. Our readers who may have Dr. Fisher in hand will do well to compare on this point the two Articles of the "American Church Review," noticed in our Synopsis.

Methodism Forty Years Ago and Now. Embracing many Interesting Reminiscences and Incidents. Also the Responsibilities, Present and Prospective, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. NEWELL CULVER, Member of the New Hampshire Conference. With an Introduction, by Rev. LORENZO D. BARROWS, D.D. 12mo., pp. 309. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

A cheerful glance over the progress of Methodism for more than a generation. It is interspersed with anecdotes, personal experiences, portraiture of times past and present. It is a book for the old, as reproducing their past days; a book for the young, as presenting a picture of earlier history. During all these forty years there has been a perpetual "decline of Methodism," just as there is now. We have "declined" from narrowness, feebleness, and obscurity into breadth, strength, and predominance. A fair prospect seems to be that we shall similarly go on "declining." By what means and forces we shall "decline" in the future, even still more rapidly than in the past, is clearly shown in the Introduction by Dr. Barrows.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The Treaty of Washington. Its Negotiation, Execution, and Discussions Relating Thereto. By CALEB CUSHING. 12mo., pp. 280. New York: Harpers & Bros. 1873.

Mr. Cushing has here given a clear and spirited view of one of the most important movements in modern diplomacy. The course pursued by the English Government, and the spirit animating a large part of the English people, during our late civil war was one of the most discreditable pages in English history. It dishonored her high profession of antislaveryism. It was inspired by a most unprincipled desire for the humbling of our national power. It swept, as her administration intended, our commerce from the

ocean. The speech of Mr. Sumner did not overstate our case. That the leader in this policy should bear a name so illustrious in the annals of freedom as Russell adds to the mortification of the memory. It is sad to reflect, too, that Christian England, Evangelical England, nay, Methodist England, bore their share in this shame. The London "Times" was not more imperiously blatant in its tones than the "British Quarterly" under Dr. Vaughan, the organ of the Independents. Thanks to William Arthur, aided by the presence of Dr. M'Clintock in England, the Quarterly of the Methodists generally held a nobler tone. But there was a powerful adverse minority. Their delegate to our General Conference, Mr. Thornton, maintained a highly mysterious reserve upon the subject which had a profoundly diplomatic air to it. Nothing like a commensurate reparation has been made by the treaty.

But wars, whether in fact or in spirit, must not be perpetuated. We repudiate Bishop Marvin's diabolic maxim that the past must not be forgotten. Whether with the lately rebel States and all parties in them, or with England, their quondam essential ally, we desire oblivion of all the bad, and memory but of all the good. We would gladly facilitate all the tendencies to our becoming as one great nation, one great English-speaking family. In this treaty those memorable words, "her Britannic Majesty has authorized her High Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries to express, in a friendly spirit, the regret felt by her Majesty's Government for the escape, under whatever circumstances, of the Alabama and other vessels from British ports, and for the depredations committed by those vessels," are one of the most honorable passages in modern diplomacy. The trust expressed by Mr. Cushing that this treaty will prove a great step toward the strengthening the power of international law, and uniting the nations of the earth in the holy bonds of peace, we cheerfully believe to be well founded. It is a cheering omen that the nations of Anglo-Saxon blood are herein leaders. In the onward march of Christian civilization they are the proper coadjutors. Without some strange counteractive, like the difficulties settled in this treaty, we stand in policy and feeling related to England as to no other nation.

One of the most unfortunate phases of the relations with her caused by the late civil war is the strengthening of our factitious alliance with Russia. From Russia we received expressions of sympathy and an ostentatious display of possible support that checked the aggression of Western Europe. The result is that even now our newspapers are rather jubilant than otherwise at

the advance of Russia into Southern Asia and her menaces at English power in India. Now what affinity have we with Czarism? What special sympathy with Pan-Sclavism? Who wishes to see the Anglican civilization growing up in India, with its English literature and English and American Christianity, overrun and swamped by a flood of half Tartars? Rather than see that done we would put in force all our thunders both of diplomacy and war. Let the Northern Bear suck his paws in Siberia, but let him never thrust his nose south of the Dardanelles or the Himalayas.

Educational.

Philosophy of Rhetoric. By JOHN BASCOM. 12mo., pp. 250. New York: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co.

Professor Bascom is one of our clear thinkers and elegant writers. He brings to the present manual a full mastery of the earlier authors, and adds to them the latest results attained in professional practice. The present work is intended for the higher college classes who have had some training in mental science. It consequently develops the relations of the mental faculties to the art of persuasion. It assumes a previous drill in the elements of composition. We trust that drill has truly taken place; for we have more than once felt obliged to advise graduates of our colleges, and even theological seminaries, to go back to study the art of sentence-making in the four chapters on that subject in Blair's Lectures.

Miscellaneous.

The Black Horse and Carryall; or, Out-door Sights and In-door Thoughts. By Rev. J. HENDRICKSON M'CARTY, A.M. 12mo., pp. 314. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Patient Susie; or, Paying the Mortgage. By J. K. B. 12mo., pp. 265. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Bride and Bridegroom: A Series of Letters to a Young Married Couple. By JULIA C. R. DORR. 12mo., pp. 253. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

Three volumes of popular moral and religious literature from our Church presses. They are the sort of volume for which we are glad to say there is a perpetual demand, and we trust they will be found the right supply.

Questions of the Day. By Rev. JOHN HALL, D.D. 12mo., pp. 343. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1873.

A volume of highly respectable shallownesses.

Diamonds, Unpolished and Polished. By Rev. J. F. RICHMOND. 12mo., pp. 249. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Mr. Richmond, contributor of an article to our present Quarterly, has elaborated all the phases of the diamond as an emblem of the varieties of human character, deducing admonitory lessons therefrom, and so making quite a diamond of a book.

The Constitutional History of England. From the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II. By HENRY HALLAM, LL.D., F.R.S. Incorporating the Author's latest Additions and Corrections and Adapted to the Use of Students. By WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 747. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

A compressed but not abridged edition of a work which has long possessed a classic and standard position. To the legal and ecclesiastical scholar alike it is a desideratum.

The Land of Shadowing Wings; or, The Empire of the Sea. By H. LOOMIS. 12mo., pp. 279. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

These chapters are the public addresses of the author in behalf of seamen, and are full of piquant thoughts in trenchant style.

The Man with the Book; or, The Bible Among the People. By JOHN MATTHIAS WEYLAND. 12mo., pp. 300. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

Music Hall Sermons. By WILLIAM H. H. MURRAY, Pastor of Park-st. Church, Boston. 12mo., pp. 207. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1873.

The Lives of the British Reformers. From Wickliff to Saxe. 8vo., pp. 502. London Religious Tract Society.

The Prophet Daniel Explained. In a Series of Readings for Young Persons. Translated by MARGARET BLACKSTONE. 18mo., pp. 248. London: J. & C. Mozely. Winchester: Warren & Sons.

Text-Book of Intellectual Philosophy. For Schools and Colleges. By J. T. CHAMPLIN, D.D., President of Colby University. 12mo., pp. 312. New York and Chicago: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co.

Star Papers; or, Experiences of Art and Nature. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. 12mo., pp. 447. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1873.

Ferdinand De Soto, the Discoverer of the Mississippi. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. 12mo., pp. 351. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1873.

Chapters of Intellectual Philosophy. Designed to Accompany Champlin's Text-Book of Intellectual Philosophy. By J. S. CHAMPLIN, President of Colby University. 12mo., pp. 83. New York: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co. 1873.

Antology. An Inductive System of Mental Science, whose Center is the Will, and whose Completion is the Personality. A Vindication of the Manhood of Man and the Godhood of God, and the Divine Authorship of Nature. By Rev. D. H. HAMILTON, D.D. 8vo., pp. 702. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1873.

How I Came Out From Rome. An Autobiography. By C. L. TRIVIER. 12mo., pp. 230.

Through the Eye to the Heart; or, Eye-Teaching in the Sunday-School. By Rev. W. L. CRAFTS. With an Introduction by J. H. VINCENT, D.D., and an Appendix for Infant-Class Teachers by Miss SARA J. TIMANUS. 12mo., pp. 219. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Expression: Its Anatomy and Philosophy. By Sir CHARLES BELL, K.H. Pp. 200. New York: Samuel R. Wells. 1873.

Play and Profit in My Garden. By Rev. E. P. ROE. 12mo., pp. 349. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Renata of Este: A Chapter from the History of the Reformation in France and Italy. By Rev. CARL STRACH. Translated from the German by CATHERINE E. HURST. 16mo., pp. 352. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Morag: A Tale of Highland Life. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Motherly Talks With Young Housekeepers. Embracing Eighty-seven Brief Articles on Topics of Home Interest, and about Five Hundred Choice Receipts for Cooking, etc. By Mrs. H. W. BEECHER. 12mo., pp. 492. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1873.

The Destiny of Man. By WILLIAM ERWIN. 12mo., pp. 312. New York: S. W Green. 1872.

The Lost Found and the Wanderer Welcomed. By WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D. 12mo., pp. 170. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

Annetta; or, the Story of a Life. By MARGIE S. HUGHES. 16mo., pp. 282. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

The Fishing Tourist: Angler's Guide and Reference Book. By CHARLES HALLOCK. 8vo., pp. 240. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1873.

Turning Points in Life. By Rev. FREDERICK ARNOLD, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford. 12mo., pp. 365. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

The Tribute of Praise. A Collection of Hymns and Tunes for Public and Social Worship and for Use in the Family Circle and Sabbath-School. 12mo., pp. 333. Boston: For sale by James P. Magee.

Through Trials to Triumph. A Story of Boys' School Life. By Miss H. S. PUTNAM. 16mo., pp. 276. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

"THE THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMATION."—As complaint is perpetually made that Calvinism, the so-called "Theology of the Reformation," is misrepresented by its opponents, we have spread out in our Fourth Article numerous statements of their own doctrine by the most eminent "reformed theologians." The original Latin of most of these statements was published in a former Quarterly some years since.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1873.

Art. I.—THEODORE PARKER.

Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. By John Weiss. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.
Works of Theodore Parker. Miss Cobbe's edition. London: Trubner & Co.

We come now to examine the claims of Mr. Parker as a Social Reformer. His career in this character was opened soon after his removal to Boston in 1846. He did a vast amount of preaching upon questions of social reform. He treated of War, Temperance, The Perishing Classes of Boston, The Dangerous Classes, The Duties and Rights of Women. Hardly a reform was mooted in those days, when the air swarmed with them, which he did not discuss with courage and frankness. The most visible result of this activity is found in the published sermons and speeches he has left to posterity. No doubt something in the way of practical work ensued from so much speech, but nothing striking or permanent. His way was hedged up by the fact that his arguments for such causes were so saturated with religious skepticism as to render it impossible for moderate Unitarians, to say nothing of Evangelicals, to co-operate with him. Then it is said that the effective working force which gathered about him, and furnished the funds for his operations, never amounted to more than two hundred persons. A careful study of Mr. Parker's advocacy of these causes shows that his thoughts were addressed mainly to their industrial and political aspects. He had the homely air and dollar-and-cent style of argument for which Franklin

was so famous. There is a like absence in Parker of a pervading appeal to the national conscience. He evidently thought that if he could only convince the nation of the unprofitableness of social evils he should at length root them out. He could not believe that individuals and nations would long act in contradiction to their temporal interests. As if the nations had not long been convinced of the unprofitableness of war, intemperance, and licentiousness! The general stand-point which Parker discussed these social questions was thus by no means the highest and most effective. Such arguments can at best only open the way for a true reform; they cannot effect it. The total absence of the real Christian element in his discussions is apparent to even a cursory reader. It would be tedious to quote in evidence of these assertions. Let any who are curious in the matter compare slowly and with care all Parker's publications on slavery with Bishop Haven's National Sermons. He will then feel the distinction here asserted.

It was especially to the Antislavery Reform that Parker's best hours and efforts were consecrated. If we can estimate wisely his merits and his defects in this movement, we shall be able to fix his general worth as a Reformer. Let us follow Messrs. Weiss and Parker in drawing out a schedule of what the latter did in this department. He was not an original member of the antislavery party. In Watertown he had the courage to admit a colored girl as a member of his private school, but had not courage to retain her when certain of his patrons objected. He was at Eastham Camp-meeting in 1836, and recorded that in the preaching "there was occasionally a touch on the subject of slavery. Who wonders at it?" He was settled at West Roxbury nearly four years before he uttered a word that has come down to us on slavery; then he preached, Jan. 31, 1841, a sermon "Of Slavery." This was repeated Jan. 4, 1843, and afterward published. His subsequent publications on this subject are given, with abbreviated titles, in the following list: "Doings of the Abolitionists," a speech at Faneuil Hall, May 31, 1848; "The Free-Soil Movement," Dec., 1848; "Mr. Webster's Speech," March 25, 1850; "Speech at the New England Antislavery Convention," Boston, May 29, 1850; "Discourse on the Death of President

Taylor," July 14, 1850; "Function and Place of Conscience in Relation to the Laws of Men," Sunday, Sept. 22, 1850; "The State of the Nation," Nov. 28, 1850; "Speech at the Ministerial Conference in Boston," May 29, 1851; "The Boston Kidnapping," (Sims') April 12, 1852; "The Aspect of Freedom in America," a speech at Abingdon, July 5, 1852; "Discourse on the Death of Webster," Oct. 31, 1852; "The Nebraska Question," Sunday, Feb. 12, 1854; "The Condition of America," an address in the Tabernacle, New York, May 12, 1854; "Thoughts on the Progress of America and the Influence of her Diverse Institutions," Boston, May 31, 1854; "The New Crime against Humanity," sermon, June 4, 1854; "The Law of God and the Statutes of Men," June 18, 1854; "Sermon on the Dangers which Threaten the Rights of Man in America," Sunday, July 2, 1854.

A series of important and timely subjects, discussed in a period full of political excitement and peril! But besides this collection, Mr. Weiss gives the titles and a brief characterization of the contents of as many more unpublished sermons and speeches on the same subject, covering nearly the same period as the preceding series. There is no reason to think that any thing of real value is omitted from the published collection. Mr. Parker had too much pride in this part of his career to have allowed such an oversight. But such a statement of his work gives only an imperfect idea of what he performed in this line during those eventful years. His preaching and his praying in public were full of the same subject. For ten years he delivered as many as forty public lectures on a wide variety of themes in many States. Whatever the real subject of his address, people soon learned that a word on Slavery was sure to be somewhere worked in. Thus he certainly spread far and wide a spirit of deep hostility to that iniquity. This work cost time and effort and departure from his life-plans. It was not heroic work in the sense in which Torrey's or Lovejoy's work was. It was not self-sacrificing, like that of Garrison and Phillips in earlier days, but it deserves high praise.

It was the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill, in 1850, which first brought Mr. Parker before the public as a prominent actor in the Antislavery Reform. Mr. Webster had re-

pudiated the nobler sentiments of his early political career, and had deeply offended the moral sense of Massachusetts by making a long and able speech in favor of the detested bill. He claimed that this conduct was dictated by an enlarged patriotism, while the antislavery party held that it was inspired by the hope of a nomination for the Presidency from the South. His effort, if sincere, was utterly vain; his hope, if he cherished it, was bitterly disappointed. The provisions of the Fugitive Slave Bill were such as to awaken consternation in the Northern States. Before its passage the negro who had escaped from Southern bondage to any free State was secure. He found friends, work, honest pay, fair treatment, and prosperity. If the law was sometimes careless of his rights, or public sentiment occasionally excluded him from schools and churches, there was enough sympathy for him to enable him to live in quiet and safety. The new law changed this comfortable *status* of things. Its measures were prompt and unjust. Evidence on which a conviction for petty larceny could not be secured was deemed ample for the remanding of a human being into slavery. The proceedings were conducted before the officers of United States courts, and were backed by the authority and forces of the nation. The commissioner who heard the evidence, and decided the destiny of the fugitive, received five dollars if the slave was discharged, ten if he was surrendered to his claimant. The anxiety and danger of this class were now extreme. Many of them had been for years living in Northern cities. Some had families about them. Some had accumulated respectable fortunes, and had the charge of profitable business. Any hour their retreat might become known; any day their former masters, armed with the civil power of the United States courts, might reclaim their services. Their best friends were obliged to tell them that no protection in law still existed for them. They were advised that nothing but the protection of the British flag would give them entire security. Forty fled from Boston alone within three days after the bill had passed. In other States many fugitives were arrested and returned to the South. Many a clergyman was asked to give aid and counsel to these endangered persons. A feeling of nearly universal indignation was aroused. Men asked each other whether they should sit idly

by and contemplate the consignment of their fellow-men to the horrors of the house of bondage? whether they should assist the master, if required, in recovering his property? In Massachusetts, the center of resistance was in Boston. Not that Boston herself was free from all complicity with this national shame and crime. Boston had politicians and lawyers mean enough to undertake the humiliating task of rendition. She had ministers so impressed with the need of doing something to save the Union as to explain to their fellow-citizens and Christian brethren that it was a religious duty, under the Constitution, to aid the infamous business. One clergyman went so far as to say that he would return his own mother, if the law required it at his hands, to bondage. The press was largely cowed and subservient.

But Boston had men in her who were faithful to the noblest traditions of her history. A Vigilance Committee, made up of the most active and trusty friends of the slave, was formed. They aided such as were in personal danger to escape to Canada. They strove to make public opinion unfavorable to the execution of the new law. They raised moneys required for these various purposes. They notified the public of the arrival and movements of the slave-hunters. They secured the organization of similar vigilance committees throughout the State. In conjunction with the Underground Railroad, they promoted the safe removal of many imperiled men to Canada.

It was impossible that a man of Parker's antecedents and character should keep clear of such a conflict. All that was best and noblest in him flamed up into zeal and activity in behalf of freedom. The memories of Lexington and Concord set his pulses in motion. His American nature was true to the noblest inspirations of America. He left his study, as his grandfather had left his farm, to head the fight against tyranny. We find him Chairman of the Executive Committee, assisted by the following members: Joshua B. Smith, Lewis Hayden, Samuel G. Howe, Wendell Phillips, Edmund Jackson, Francis Jackson, Charles K. Whipple. The Vigilance Committee numbered in all two hundred and fifty persons. They had also a Legal Committee, consisting of lawyers. The main direction of affairs naturally fell to the Executive Committee, of which Parker was chairman. This combination of all the best friends

of the slave being secured, the real leaders of the movement were ready for action. They declared the Fugitive Slave Bill unconstitutional, affirmed their conviction that men mean enough to obey its behests were not to be found in Boston, and advised the colored people to remain at their homes. Some boasted that no fugitive should ever be returned from that city. There were Southerners who were particularly anxious to effect the removal of fugitives to the South from Boston, in order to show that the law could be executed anywhere at the North. The administration of Pierce was eager to show its subserviency to Southern ideas. Northern politicians and Boston traders were desirous that the loyalty of the proud old metropolis should be tested. With such a concurrence of aims, trouble was sure to come.

Trouble came first in the shape of two slave-hunters from Macon, Ga., who visited Boston in October, 1850, to secure the arrest and return to slavery of William and Ellen Craft. The Vigilance Committee alarmed the town. The slave-hunters and their allies were bent upon carrying off the fugitives, "just for the principle of the thing." Craft was armed to the teeth, and instructed to make desperate resistance in case an attempt was made upon his freedom. His wife was concealed. Parker was evidently bent upon a collision. His temper is best indicated in these words from his Journal: "I saw William this morning. He seemed cool and resolute. I told him I thought it was no use to put the matter off and cut off the dog's tail by inches. If he were to take the bull by the horns, he had better do it to-day than to-morrow. So he thought. I inspected his arms—a good revolver with six caps on, a large pistol and small ones, a large dirk and a short one. All was right." How like Captain Parker, who thought that "if war was meant it had better begin then and there," at Lexington, April 19, 1775! It is evident that Parker would have been glad of a collision, not on account of Craft, whose chances would have been the worse for it, but for its general effect on the public. He would have been glad to see the question put to a Massachusetts' jury, whether a man who kills another to secure his own natural right of freedom is a murderer? The slave-hunters were alarmed at the popular fury their presence had awakened. It was resolved to frighten them out of their purpose. Parker and others called

on them at the United States Hotel. Parker told the men that he came as a friend to them, and a minister, to keep them from harm. They accused him of stirring up a mob against them in their attempts to execute the law. Parker replied that they must see they could not arrest the Crafts and get them out of the city. They thought so themselves. They complained of ill-treatment. They could hardly go upon the street but children cried out, "See the slave-hunters," etc. Parker told them that he had once stood between them and violence, but would not promise to do it again. Indeed, he could not have done it, but for an impression that they had promised to leave town. They would give him no further pledge. He gave them indirect threats, and left them. They promptly stole off to Newton Corner, and took the New York train.

To heighten the impression of this transaction upon the public mind, Parker had an account of the marriage of William and Ellen Craft printed in the newspapers. They had long been married after the manner of slaves, but their union was not in due legal form. A certificate of marriage was procured, and Parker married them with unusual rites. He first addressed them on their duties to each other in the usual terms. Then he told Craft that "their position demanded peculiar duties of him. He was an outlaw; there was no law which protected his liberty in the United States; for that he must depend on the public opinion of Boston, and on himself. If a man attacked him intending to return him to slavery, he had a right, a natural right, to resist the man unto death; but he might refuse to exercise that right for *himself* if he saw fit, and suffer himself to be reduced to slavery rather than kill, or even hurt, the slave-hunter who should attack him. But his *wife* was dependent on him for protection; it was his duty to protect her, a duty which it seemed to me he could not decline. So I charged him, if worst came to worst, to defend the life and liberty of his wife against any slave-hunter at all hazards, though in doing so he dug his own grave and the grave of a thousand men." When he had married them he put a Bible into William's right hand, and told him its truths were intended to save his soul and his wife's soul, and bade him use them for that purpose. Then he put a sword, or "Californian knife," into Craft's right hand, and told him to use that, if things came to extremities, to save

the life and liberty of his companion. But he was to use it in justice, not in wrath; "if you cannot use the sword in defense of your wife's liberty without hating the man you strike, your action will not be without sin."

So far as the Crafts were concerned there was something theatrical in this ceremony, since they were about to go to England. But Parker intended to impress colored husbands with his view of their duties, and stir them up to resist the slave-hunter even to blood. He likewise meant to impress the public imagination and conscience with this representation of the exposures and duties of these fugitives in their new perils. That he succeeded in both his ends there can be no doubt.

The course pursued by Mr. Parker in this case may be taken as representative of his proceedings in all such cases till the close of his career. He was among the most active of the Executive Committee. In the Shadrach case the colored people had made a rescue before the Vigilants had a chance to act. Yet they aided not a little in the legal trials which ensued. Great was their delight when the jury refused to convict. A touch of humor now and then lights up the gloom of their doings, as in the following description, in a placard, of the slave-hunter Davis: "He is an unusually ill-looking fellow, about five feet eight inches high, wide-shouldered. He has a big mouth, black hair, and a good deal of dirty bushy hair on the lower part of his face. He has a Roman nose; one of his eyes has been knocked out. He looks like a Pirate, and knows how to be a Stealer of Men."

It is easy to guess what pen traced out this ineffaceable portrait, and its author must have felt a thrill of pleasure over its terse perfection.

When Sims was hurried off, under false pretenses, after the denial of the writ of *habeas corpus*, to slavery, the pride of Boston was humbled in the dust. Parker employed the ensuing Fast Day to denounce the deed. He let loose his anger at the commissioner, Mr. George T. Curtis. He knew how to make such opportunities serve various ends. Mr. Commissioner Curtis chanced to be one of the parishioners of Dr. Gannett. Dr. Gannett had refused Parker his hand, and taxed him with "Infidelity," ten years earlier, on the publication of Parker's "Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion." Parker had a

long memory. In a discussion before the Unitarian Ministerial Conference he put the case thus: "When a parishioner, a fugitive from slavery, a woman pursued by the kidnappers, came to my house, what could I do less than take her in and defend her to the last? But who sought her life or liberty? A parishioner of my Brother Gannett came to kidnap a member of my Church. Mr. Gannett preaches a sermon to justify the Fugitive Slave Law, demanding that it should be obeyed; yes, calling on his Church-members to kidnap mine, and sell them into bondage forever. Yet all this while Mr. Gannett calls himself a 'Christian' and me an 'Infidel!'"

When Anthony Burns was seized, in 1854, on a false charge of robbery, every precaution was used to make his rendition swift and sure. Though convicted of no crime, the officers of the United States handcuffed him as a felon. The marshal's guard was made up of the vilest scum of the worst haunts in the city. They were overbold and overbrutal in this vile service. Before he had given the case a hearing, the commissioner told Wendell Phillips the case was so clear that Burns would probably be returned to his claimant. Legal measures were taken to delay as long as possible the final proceedings. Messrs. R. H. Dana and C. M. Ellis offered to serve as his counsel. Friendly voices urged him to ask for a hearing. Though much disheartened, he ventured to follow their advice. The lawyers plead for delay, that they might have time to investigate the case. This motion was resisted by the claimant, and reluctantly granted by the commissioner. The cause was adjourned from Friday till Monday. A public meeting was at once called at Faneuil Hall. Mr. Parker, among others, addressed the throng that Friday night. He directly provoked the people to undertake a rescue. "I have heard a great many hurrahs and cheers for liberty; I have not seen a great many deeds done for liberty. I ask you, Are we to have deeds as well as words?" He said that the mayor and the city police were not in sympathy with the slave-catchers. He told them there was a law, and a final one, in their hands and feet, which they could execute when they would; and he carried an adjournment to meet the next day, at nine o'clock, in Court Square. Mr. Weiss thinks Parker hoped to get Burns off by moral intimidation and a bloodless rescue. This was probably

rather his hope than his expectation. That very evening an unsuccessful attempt at rescue was made. In the tumult one of the marshal's guard was shot. Firing began, and when it was known that a man had been killed, a panic seized the rescuers, and they fled. The fate of Burns was sealed from that hour. Offers to purchase him were refused. A company of marines was marched over from Charlestown to reinforce the marshal. The case was speedily settled by granting the prayer of the claimant. A company of soldiers guarded the slave down through State-street, amid general indignation, to the wharf. Thence he was shipped to Virginia. Warrants were issued for the arrest and trial of the leading participators in the Faneuil Hall meeting. Parker, with others, was arrested and released on bail, but when the case came to trial proceedings were quashed on the ground of some defect in the indictment. He regretted this fruitless conclusion. He had prepared a careful defense, and coveted the chance of putting slavery on its trial. We have seen that Parker was ready to go any length to break down the dominion of slavery. He wanted to cast votes enough to overcome the South, and to establish Northern men and measures in the Government. But he was equally prepared for any bold, and even illegal, scheme to harass slavery. He was one of the few who had some just insight into the plans of Captain John Brown. He was one of a committee of five to aid Brown in any designs he might form for the overthrow of slavery. He had a general idea of the nature of those plans whose attempted execution presently startled the entire South.

It is easy to see what exceptions may be taken to the course Parker pursued on the question of slavery. It is needless to defend him or his measures. Such proceedings cannot be justified in law. They can only be defended in morals on the ground that an irrepressible conflict had opened, in which men were compelled to choose between the divine commands and the statutes of men. Parker had repeatedly given notice of his purpose to break any human laws which forbade him to have compassion on the helpless. In a public letter, addressed to President Fillmore, he said: "I must say I would rather lie all my life in jail, and starve there, than refuse to protect one of these parishioners of mine. Do not call me a fanatic;

I am a cool and sober man, but *I must reverence the laws of God, come of that what will come. I must be true to my religion.*" After such public notice of his intentions, served on the President of the United States, he perhaps held himself free to violate impious and unjust laws in behalf of the bondman. Certainly he was not careful to defend his conduct in this matter. He remembered Lowell's line:

> "Before man made us citizens, great nature made us men."

I have been dwelling upon this part of Parker's career with more pleasure than any other portion of it has inspired. It would be a true satisfaction if nothing more required to be said about it. But this would not be just to Parker or to others. It is a matter of prime necessity to show the deliberate falsehood of his testimony in relation to the influence of the Bible and the Church on his course upon this question. A few quotations will show the issues he made:

> I had not long been a minister before I found this worship of the Bible as a fetish hindering me at every progressive step. . . . There was no virtue, but the Scriptures could furnish an argument against it. . . . Even slavery "was of God," for the divine statutes in the Old Testament admitted the principle that man might own a man as well as a garden or an ox, and provided for the measure. Moses and the Prophets were on its side, and neither Paul of Tarsus nor Jesus of Nazareth uttered a direct word against it.

This passage may be taken in two ways: either Parker is here describing the conclusions to which he came in his inquiry into the relations of the Bible and Reform, or presenting the popular prejudices grounded on the Bible which he had to meet in his work. The tone of the entire paragraph points to the former conclusion. But the sermon which he preached in January, 1841, and repeated and published two years later, shows conclusively two things: first, that Parker then thought the Bible and Christ utterly opposed to slavery; and, second, that he was ready to denounce people who held the contrary as hypocrites. The sermon shows beyond controversy that, until he had quarreled with the Bible on other grounds, he had never found it obstructive to Reform. It never became so in his eyes, until he saw that its being so would be an additional ground for rejecting it as a divine revelation.

Here is another account from Parker of his early preaching on slavery:

> I began to preach against it early, but used the greatest circumspection, for I knew the vulgar prejudice in favor of successful tyranny, and wished my few hearers thoroughly to accept the principle of justice, and apply it to this as to all other wrongs. But even in the little meeting-house at West Roxbury, though some of the audience required no teaching in this matter, the very mention of American slavery as wicked at first offended all my hearers who had any connection with the Democratic party. . . . But as little by little I developed the principle of true democracy, showing its root in that love of your neighbor as yourself, which Jesus both taught and lived, and of that eternal justice which comes even to savage bosoms, and showed how repugnant slavery is to both, gradually all the more reflective and humane drew over to the side of freedom. . . . For some years, while busied with theological matters, and with laying the metaphysical foundation of my own scheme, I took no public part in the antislavery movements outside of my own little village.

The last statement is true; let us test the exactness of the former.

Mr. Weiss tells us that Parker had occasionally preached on the subject of slavery at West Roxbury. But neither Parker nor Weiss gives any data by which we can come to any exact results. This is the more to be regretted because the period from 1837 to 1846, and the situation of things at West Roxbury, made his action there a pretty fair test of his courage and fidelity. It looks as though Parker had to be stirred up by the Abolitionists of his parish to do any thing for the negro. It seems that he had promised to read a petition on the Latimer case in the pulpit after sermon. The date and the details of the transaction are not given. Parker's letter to G. Adams, in defense of his subsequent refusal to read the petition, has an air of apology. He seems to have been under suspicion of wanting fidelity to the slave. This matter is one of much importance in respect to Parker's manliness. His note on the sermons at Eastham, some years earlier, shows that his convictions were antislavery. When he first preached on slavery, in 1841, there was a parish disturbance. For two years he kept silence, not without suspicions that "his great circumspection" was truckling to hostile opinion. In his next discussion of the subject he merely repeated his former sermon. The sermon

itself is weak and unsatisfactory. It is founded on Rom. vi, 16: "Know ye not that, to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are?" "Servants," says Parker, "means slaves. Men are slaves to sin." He tries to show this in various directions. At length he introduces a short but plain condemnation of American slavery. He holds that this system contradicts the Bible, the spirit and teaching of Christ, and the Constitution. There is no proof that in his first parish Parker ever went beyond this twice-repeated brief condemnation of slavery. When he reviewed his ministry before leaving for Europe, in 1843, he tells what he had tried to do, but he does not mention this among his good works. On the ocean he sketched out what he meant to do in practical work on getting home. He intended to labor in behalf of temperance and education and other things, but so little was slavery in his thoughts that he did not even mention it. Nor is there any proof that he meddled with it after his return from Europe, so long as he stayed in West Roxbury. It may have been otherwise, but Weiss furnishes no proof of it.

Another part of his tactics was to connect the Christian Churches of America as closely as possible with slavery. In his first book he began this disingenuous course, and he followed it up to the end. In 1843 he wrote, "Religion is no restraint in business, no restraint in politics, and in literature it is not felt. It dares not speak against drunkenness and prostitution. . . . When did the Christianity of the Church ever denounce a popular sin; the desolation of intemperance; the butchery of Indians; the soul-destroying traffic in the flesh and blood of men for whom Christ died?"

In 1854 he said, "Money has got inaugurated into the Church—it is a Church of commerce. . . . In the American Church money is God. The peculiar sins of money and the rich, they are never preached against; it is the Church of commerce, wealth its heaven and the millionaire its saint; its ministers should be ordained not 'by the imposition of hands,' but of bank bills—of small denomination. . . . Eight and twenty thousand Protestant ministers, and not a sect that is opposed to slavery! O the Church! the Church of America! False to the great prophets of the Old Testament, the great world's Prophet of the New." In the "Experience" he could still

write, "The Church takes a 'South-side' view of slavery, as indeed she does of each other wickedness presently popular, and of 'good report.' . . . 'There (in the Bible) the slaveholder finds the chief argument for his ownership of men, and, in Africa or New England, kidnaps the weak, his mouth drooling with texts from 'the authentic word of God.'"

Whoever takes the trouble to read his works through will find this a fair specimen of his prevailing tone toward the Christian Church. Especially is this true of his treatment of the relations of the Church and slavery. Meantime he had a cunning defense of such falsehood. He would at rare intervals select some minister of conspicuous devotion to the antislavery cause and laud him to the skies. There would be honorable mention of this or that particular Church for its zeal in behalf of the slave. The reader of Parker's antislavery speeches and discourses will find such passages very infrequent. Those of an opposite nature bristle from his pages. The few Christian ministers and Churches he praised were invariably represented as exceptions to the great mass. Thus his very laudation had a libelous sting in it. These laudations sometimes appeared only when he was called to account for misrepresentation. In this way he sought to poison the reputation of the American Church. In 1854 he was guilty of all these offenses against honor and truth in his sermon on "The New Crime Against Humanity." Dr. Edward Beecher, in a newspaper article, reminded Parker that his assertions had been too sweeping in the following particulars: first, he had spoken as if *the pulpit* had been a unit in support of slavery; second, had represented *the clergy* as unanimous for the rendition of Sims; third, had declared that not a prominent minister had spoken against the Slave Bill and its execution; and, fourth, that he gave reluctant testimony to the fact that three thousand and fifty New England ministers had petitioned Congress to spare the country the dishonor of the Nebraska Bill, not mentioning the fact in their praise, but only that he might scourge Edward Everett. Dr. Beecher proves that these statements were so sweeping as to be really false. He pointed out the palpable injustice of such broad assertions. He said, "Mr. Parker is convinced that to rob even one slave of his liberty is a crime. He does not seem as deeply to feel that

it is a crime even to rob our ministers of that reputation which in his own case he prizes so highly."

To this accusation Parker replied, first, that "he had often done public honor to ministers opposed to slavery." He does not show how this gives him the right to speak of the pulpit and the clergy as a unit in favor of slavery; second, that "Dr. Beecher mentions *sixteen Orthodox ministers* who published matter in opposition to the Fugitive Slave Bill. This is not a very large number for all the Churches in New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts to furnish. I can mention more." Here is a palmary instance of Parker's unfairness. First, he assumes that in a hasty newspaper article a full statement of what had been published by Orthodox ministers would be likely to be made. He takes no notice of the fact that Dr. Beecher says he has other such sermons on file besides the sixteen, or of the fact that he asserts he knows of others in print which he has not on file. To Beecher's statement that he knows of many faithful and able sermons on the subject still unpublished, Parker rejoins, "I know nothing of what was said *privately*, or of sermons which never get spoken out of the little parish where they were written." Beecher said nothing of *private* speeches. Parker knew that in every large Church embracing many small parishes there would be fifty such unpublished sermons to one that got into print. Parker had declared that "Andover went for kidnapping." Three of the six Andover professors signed a paper applauding Mr. Webster's course. Three refused to sign. Two of the signers were emeritus professors. Of the four acting professors only one signed. The others showed their sentiments in their action. It would have been the simplest justice to have said Andover was divided on the question. A generous man would have noted that all the rising men in the faculty were against the iniquity. Parker preferred to say "Andover went for kidnapping." When the facts were pointed out to him, he said: "I do not think you have made out a very strong case for Andover." Of course this is manliness and candor!

Parker adds that he cannot retract his opinion that the majority of all the clergy favored the execution of the law. He gives singular evidence of it. The Vigilants had appointed a large committee to secure aid from the Churches for fugitives.

They sent circulars asking aid to every Church in Massachusetts. Eighty-seven replied, and gave $1,484 56. It seems as though something of the spirit of Christ still animated men who would intrust benevolent moneys to the hands of those who blasphemed what they held most sacred, and systematically belied their honest fame.

His attitude towards the Methodist Church is a fair exhibition of his temper. In one place he lets slip the fact that the Methodist Church responded most generously to appeals in behalf of the slave. Then he calls it the most humane of Churches. But when Wilbraham Academy asked a gift from the State of twenty-five thousand dollars, he remembered that it would be mere waste to "help breed bigots." In Massachusetts the Methodist Church had hardly a minister who was not antislavery. Years before Parker had opened his mouth with great circumspection at West Roxbury, the new England Annual Conference had passed the most thoroughgoing resolutions against human bondage. The same was true of all the Methodist conferences in the Eastern States. Parker either never heard of the fact, or else ignored it. He gives not a hint that such was the fact. He lumped them with the Church of America, which was faithless alike to God and man. A rude slander against nearly one hundred thousand New England Christians!

Singular fact! Parker himself confesses that he acted upon essentially the same principles as those ministers who, in the Churches of commerce, the Slave States and elsewhere, stifled their convictions on slavery that they might still vent their theology. In respect to slavery, the ministry may be divided into three classes: those who believed in the righteousness of the system and maintained their opinion, those who believed it sinful and were faithful to their convictions, and those who believed it altogether wrong, but for various motives kept silence on the topic. There could be no difference of opinion among candid and honorable men concerning the two former classes. In the last class were included all those who, from base motives—as love of ease, reputation, money, social position, educational position—observed a silence which their consciences pronounced sinful. Such merit only condemnation. There was another class who honestly thought it a Christian duty to omit their testimony on this subject in communities and Churches

that would not endure it, that they might in unrestrained freedom perform their duty as ministers. This class appears to me wholly wrong in their judgment. Such license with duty ends in the substitution of selfish interest for a high sense of responsibility. No reprobation can be too severe toward such offenses. But, after all, was not their fault precisely this, that they put fidelity to a scheme of theology before fidelity to the victims of cruel oppression? Parker did the same thing. This shall be proven from his own words. In showing how he was led to lecture so much Parker says:

> I found I could say what I pleased in the lecture-room so long as I did not put my thought into a theological shape. . . . Thus I have had a wide field of operation where I might diffuse such ideas as I thought needful for the progress and welfare of the people. . . . I thought I could make a new, deep, and lasting impression of some one great truth on five thoughtful men out of each thousand who heard me. If I spoke but thus efficiently to sixty thousand in a winter there would be three hundred so impressed, and in ten years it would be three thousand. . . . When people did look me in the face and listen for an hour or two while I spoke plain, right on, on matters familiar to their patriotic hopes, their business, and their bosoms, as their faces glowed in the excitement of what they heard I saw that the clerical prejudice was stealing out of their minds, and I left them other than I found them. . . . They said, Who knows but he may be honest even in his theological notions? Perhaps he is right in his religion. Priests have been a little mistaken sometimes before now, and said hard words against rather good sort of men. . . . I am glad I heard him.

Parker states his belief that his lectures influenced men theologically quite as much as he had expected. He adds: "Those ministers were in the right who, years ago, said, Keep that man out of the lecture-room; don't let him be seen in public. Every word he speaks on any subject is a blow against our religion! They meant, against their theology."

How can a purpose to make lecturing of all sorts mainly a vehicle for the conveyance to the public ear of an unpopular theology be more plainly declared than it is here? It is clear that Parker meant to make slavery, temperance, and all other reforms, subserve the conversion of men to his new theology. He would have preferred the temporary continuance of these evils, as a means for the better establishment of his theological system with the public, to their prompt extirpation without such

an accompaniment. He believed the popular theology the greatest curse of the race, and thought its overthrow would be the greatest good that could accrue to the world. If his conduct was right, the men who refrain from fidelity to any reform lest they should weaken the Christian faith in society, in their eyes the highest boon of heaven, are not wrong. They act on the same principle which Parker confesses. So fully was Parker controlled by this rule that, even in the most desperate days of pro-slavery triumph, he never forgot it. In 1854 he sent his sermon on the Nebraska question to Senator, afterward Chief-Justice Chase of Ohio. Mr. Chase was honest enough to reply in these terms: "Shall I not say to you frankly how much I regret that, on the great question of the divine origin of the Bible and the divine nature of Christ, your views are so little in harmony with those of almost all who labor with you in the great cause of human enfranchisement and progress; and that I could not help wishing that in this sermon your distinctive opinions had not been brought forward. Some of your expressions grate harshly on my ears." Mr. Parker replied: "1. The introduction of my peculiar views in this matter will do no harm to the special matter in hand. . . . 2. The common notion respecting the divine origin of the Bible and the divine nature of Jesus Christ I regard as an error, one, too, most *fatal to the development of mankind.* Now in all my labors I look to the general development of mankind as well as to the removal of every such special sin, *American slavery*, *war*, *drunkenness*, etc., therefore I introduce my general principle along with my *special measures.* The general principle enters into the public ear, the public mind, and what is true of it will go into the heart of mankind and do its work. I think I work prudently. I know I do not *rashly*, and without consideration."

The meaning of such language is not to be mistaken. Parker held it of greater importance to get his theology rooted in the public mind than to bring to pass a speedier emancipation of the bondmen by omitting the heretical views which made him obnoxious to Christian America. In other words, he subordinated the interests of the slave to the interests of his theology. This is precisely the course which the class of the clergy whom he bitterly condemned had pursued. He ought to have lauded

them or condemned himself with them. The popularity of the antislavery cause in the North was made to help the religious notions of the Music Hall preacher. Whenever the unpopularity of his religious conclusions would be a burden to the cause of freedom, Parker did not hesitate to impose the unwelcome load. The same rule would have made him utterly silent had he been fast anchored in a slaveholding community. He would have chosen to propagate his theology, and have cheered himself with the hope that its general principles would ultimately do for the bondmen what he was forced to leave unattempted. His duty and his pleasure coincided to push him to the fore front of the antislavery agitation from 1850 to 1857. His interests dictated the same course. He obeyed them all with evident pleasure, and a keen sense of the advantages of his situation for warfare on the Church.

Throughout his whole career there was one thing which Parker denounced and abhorred more bitterly than any political or social evil—what he styled the popular theology. This very name is a convenient fraud. It enabled him to speak of all professed Christians as adherents to the popular theology. Then he could saddle upon that theology any false or absurd opinion ever held by any class of Christians in history. It was taken for granted that such opinions logically, or at least inevitably, arose from the Christian faith. The same logic would burden the honest friends of any cause with shame. As though Republicanism must be discredited on the score of all the false and misleading theories ever held by Republicans, or the friends of monarchical government should be held to answer for all the misdeeds of sovereigns. It was vain to protest to Parker that you did not hold this particular error. Some other Christian had, and the system was charged with the total mischief. Nothing can exceed the fury and cunning with which this assault was urged. The singular spectacle drew the curious to look on, the indifferent to behold the controversial fray, the opposers of religion to hear their cause advocated with unusual skill. His sincere and earnest following was never large. The friends of special reforms returned his interest in their causes by more or less patronage of his doings. Even Christians were frequently drawn by curiosity to hear him. These causes combined to give Parker a greater ap-

pearance of success than he really had. He shook the convictions and destroyed the faith of many without being able to confirm them in unbelief.

While Parker was in the full tide of seeming success, suddenly, in the winter of 1857–58, a great revival broke upon the land. It came unheralded, and moved upon the most remote and diverse regions. It entered all Christian Churches and pervaded entire communities. For a generation there had been no such season of deep and universal religious feeling. Weiss attempts to connect this gracious awakening with purely natural causes. There had been a time of commercial distress, and multitudes had less employment than usual. Men were uncertain of the present, and anxious respecting the future. In this state of mind Weiss thinks men open to any strong influence that may chance to stir them. Then they may be easily swayed to unusual good or evil. Hence the revival of 1857–58 was a natural affair—perfectly natural. Yes, indeed, unless the influence which is abroad happen to be from above nature, when it seems supernatural. Certainly the outward conditions were the same for Evangelicals and Parkerites, but no unwonted breath from Heaven wafted that winter through the Music Hall. The revival was not welcome there. What had Parker's religious work been worth, what was his cunning scheme of theology good for, if there was any really supernatural power and grace in this mysterious movement? As the lightning suddenly brightens the heavens, so the light of the glory of God shone in all the Churches. In the presence of such a work of the Spirit Parker was irritated and forced to pronounce. It was truly a work of grace, or it was fanaticism. The Music Hall theology was false, or these conversions were mere delusions. Not for a generation had the hearts of men been so stirred, and skeptics thought the day of such excitements had gone by. Silence at Music Hall would not do. Parker spoke deliberately, and charged the Church theologies with being breeders of speculative and practical atheism. Conceive the effect of such a discourse, reported widely in the daily press, upon the Christian parents in the land. Many of these had children who were not Christians, for their salvation prayer had been offered up since their childhood. Mothers who had prayed and hoped for their children, like Monica for Augustine,

through weary years, were shocked above measure to find such sentiments proclaimed by one who assumed the Christian name. The papers bore the ill-omened words into every town and village. In Boston the emotion was intense. Men said that his worst utterances were not reported in the public prints. He was charged with declaring that the sin against the Holy Ghost was committed whenever "a woman made poor bread out of good flour." This was no worse than many things he had said, no worse than things he was ready to say to the end of his life. He did say just this in a private letter to a young lady. Quotation would be superfluous to prove the ribaldry of his utterances. Let him who doubts it read the four hundred and ninety-sixth page of Weiss' second volume of the Life. Weiss says that Parker's success imperiled the revival. This is going too far; but there can be no doubt that Christian people all over the land believed his course endangered the dearest interests of immortal souls. Every Christian in country towns who had a son in Boston held such influences mortally dangerous. Boston Christians felt themselves and their God flouted and defied before the community. Dr. Finney, of Oberlin, the well-known evangelist, was then preaching at the Park-street church. The interest was intense. Souls hung in the balance. The blasphemies of Music Hall filled the city. What should be done. A few members of the Church resolved to hold a private meeting for special prayer over Mr. Parker's case. About forty met in the vestry of Park-street Church, March 6, 1858, and made their appeal to God in prayer. Somehow the proceedings got to Parker's ears, and he and Mr. Weiss have taken pains to spread them before the public as examples of the gross fetishism prevailing in the Christian Church. Our assistance shall not be wanting to them in this effort. Here are some of the prayers offered:

O Lord, if this man is a subject of grace convert him, and bring him into the kingdom of thy dear Son. But if he is beyond the reach of the saving influences of the Gospel, remove him out of the way, and let his influence die with him.

O Lord, send confusion and distraction into his study this afternoon, and prevent his finishing his preparation for his labors tomorrow; or if he shall attempt to desecrate thy holy day by at-

tempting to speak to the people, meet him there, Lord, and confound him, so that he shall not be able to speak!

O Lord, meet this infidel on his way, who, like another Saul of Tarsus, is persecuting the Church of God, and cause a light to shine around him which shall bring him to the earth, and make him a defender of the faith which he has so long labored to destroy.

There were petitions offered that Parker's hearers might be drawn over to attendance on purer doctrines. These prayers appear to me eminently Christian. Paul was a pretty good Christian for his times. Yet when the Galatian Church was disturbed by false teachers, he said he wished the troublers were even cut off. Those who prayed for Parker at Park-street believed it would be better for him that he should be, in whatever way, hindered from promulgating his skeptical opinions. They prayed, not in wrath, but in awe and love. They prayed that, if possible, he might be converted, and made an heir of heaven. Could any prayer be more benevolent? They even desired that, like Saul of Tarsus, he might become an eminent defender of the faith of Christ. Could anything more Christian in them, or more honorable for him, have been coveted at the hand of God? The language of Paul to Elymas shows how an apostle could speak. The twenty-third chapter of Matthew shows how Jesus could denounce evil men. The petitions at Park-street vestry seem to have been eminently mild and forgiving.

But Parker quickly gave them to understand that he was not to be converted. On the fourth of April he preached on the revival. Among other things he said:

Eighteen hundred and twenty-one years ago, last Thursday, a band of Roman soldiers surrounded a man whom they had nailed to the cross, not because he was a murderer, or a kidnapper, or a deceitful politician, or a hypocritical priest who thought one thing in his study and said another in his pulpit, but because he had taught a religion of love by which a man could be saved without the blood of bulls; because he was esteemed a blasphemer of the priests, who did not believe in a religion of love and charity, but "passed by on the other side," perhaps because they were in a hurry to attend a prayer-meeting at Jerusalem. . . . By some of the creeds God is variable, ill-natured, revengeful—one who goes into a minister's study to put a hook in his jaws.

He charged that the revival

Had been skillfully got up. . . . They set the revival machinery

in motion. That is as well known as M'Cormick's reaper, and needs not to be described. It requires only a spark in one place to set fire to a whole country. The meetings are gathered in the same way as cattle-shows and musters are. It is advertised in the newspapers that the Rev. Mr. Great-Talk will preach on such a day, and placards are posted in the streets. It is a business operation, and reminds me of the placards of the clothing-dealers in North-street, the Park-street Church having become the Oak Hall of revivals. There is much that is encouraging in the revival, but in the conduct of it there is much which is profoundly melancholy. The idea of God and the religion which is inculcated, if it should convert every body, including the administration of the Democratic party, the Supreme Court, and Congress, would not add one ounce of humanity to the converts, but would weaken and deaden the piety and morality of the people.

If the revival was a work of the Holy Spirit, surely here was blasphemy against it. He continued to speak of it in the same tone to the last. Toward the close of the "Experience as a Minister" he resumes this topic, as follows:

Since my present illness began, some of my theological foes have, publicly to the world and privately to me, expressed their delight that I am not likely to trouble them much longer; in my present feebleness they read the answer to their prayers for my removal. It was the Psalmist's petition, "*Let not mine enemies triumph over me!*" I shall utter none such. If I fall let mine enemies rejoice as much as they will at the consequent thought that there is one feeble voice the less rebuking the vice of the press, the State, the market, and the Church, to speak a word of truth, freedom, justice, and natural religion; let them be glad there is one weak arm the less reaching out to help the poor, the drunken, the ignorant, the harlot, the felon, and the slave; let them thank God for the premature decrepitude of my voice, the silence of my study. . . . Let them find "answer to our prayers" in the sorrow of my personal friends—there are now many such—in the keen distress of my intimates, and the agony of my wife.

These sentences contain very serious charges against Parker's theological foes. It would be uncharitable to suppose that he really deemed them capable of any joy over the matters he mentions. He knew that their satisfaction turned wholly on the removal from the scene of action of a man whose influence appeared to them fatally pernicious. To take a similar instance, the entire northern section of the land rejoiced over the death of Stonewall Jackson. Suppose some southern journal had proclaimed it a result of the teachings of abolitionism, that a whole people could rejoice over the consequent

thought that one feeble voice the less would rebuke the vices of the army, one generous hand the less relieve the wants of the destitute, one spotless life the less lead men to virtue, and "find answer to prayer" in the sorrow of his personal friends —a numerous company—the keen distress of his intimates, and the agony of his wife, could the accusation be allowed as just? Had Parker been alive would he have been at a loss for a defense? Would not every impartial man have pronounced the charge atrocious? How was it less atrocious when hurled by Parker at his theological foes? Surely one would rather have uttered the Park-street prayers than have been guilty of these infamous insinuations.

However, the end of Parker's earthly work was at hand. For ten months more he was destined to pursue his much interrupted labors. For years there had been a gradual weakening of his vital forces from overwork. Still, but for a series of apparent accidents, he might have gone on to old age in fair health. The facts, as recited by Parker, leave room for two theories as to his end. In 1858 a friend noticed, during a journey they made together, visible signs that Parker's health was giving way. On his suggestion the Music Hall Society voted to request him to continue his annual vacation until, in the judgment of competent physicians, he should be able to resume his ordinary duties. He followed this advice for two months, when he renewed his preaching. Three weeks after an operation for fistula kept him out of the pulpit for a month. November fourteenth he returned to his work, against the judgment of his medical advisers. This went on, with the exception of one Sunday in December, till the first Sabbath in January. Then, as the audience was moving out of the hall, a voice whispered within him, "This is the last time, O Parker!" The next Sunday morning bleeding at the lungs came on, and the physicans told him he had only one chance in ten for life.

He was forbidden to work and ordered to the West Indies. There the main thing he did was to write his "Experience as a Minister." In the following spring he went to England, thence, successively, to France, to Switzerland, to Rome, to Florence, and to the grave. Those who wish to follow him step by step can do so in the pages of Weiss. He had the

consumptive's usual experience of unfounded hopes and well-justified fears. The care of friends and the skill of physicians were lavished upon him. He had the best prospect of recovery during the summer months which he spent with his friend Desor, a Swiss naturalist. The mountain air, excellent food, and cheerful society of Desor's châlet greatly aided him. Strength and vigor seemed to return, and his hopes rose high. As autumn drew on, with its growing coolness, he was forced to seek a residence for winter. Against the unanimous and urgent advice of his friends and the *savans* about him he resolved to go to Rome. He planned for a very busy winter, and made arrangements to see volcanoes and the desert. Rome, for some reason, had a resistless charm for him. A dreary winter ensued on his arrival there and destroyed any lingering hope of recovery.

When it became clear to Parker that his sickness would perhaps end in death, he looked the matter calmly in the face. He said it was hard to leave work, friends, and wife, "still *concedo*." Despite the affectation of surrendering in Latin, he felt what he said. Not that he gave up all hope of recovery. He often spoke of hoping to recover and live on for twenty years. He had much work planned out, and found it hard to give up the idea of completing it. Only a few weeks before his departure he still thought he might return home and accomplish something for the world. These hopeful periods were interspersed with others of apprehension. Then he talked with submission and confidence of his departure. A few extracts will show the drift of his thoughts. To his society he wrote:

> So far as my recovery depends on me, be assured, dear friends, I shall leave nothing undone to effect it; and, so far as it is beyond human control, certainly you and I can trust the Infinite Parent of us all, without whose beneficent providence not even a sparrow falls to the ground. Living here or in heaven, we are all equally the children of that unbounded love. . . . You know I shall not complain of either destination, but bear what comes as from the Infinite Perfection. . . . I go, uncertain of the result, but equal to either fate, hoping for the pleasanter, but not afraid of the other. . . . I have never had a minute's sadness at the thought of passing to the immortals. . . . If we are sure of God, we are not long left in doubt of any other good thing. . . . I need not say what sweetness of peace and what depth of joy have come to me

from such a religion; but now, when I go stooping and feeble, when my career of usefulness seems ended and I can serve no more, but only stand and wait, I find additional comfort in the testimony of many persons on both the continents that I have helped them to a consciousness of the deep things in their own souls, and so have helped to make them nobler men.

He estimates himself and his work somewhat curiously in a letter to a friend:

O, George, the life that I am here dragging slowly to an end—tortuous but painless—is very, very imperfect, and fails of much I meant to hit, and might have reached, nay, should, had there been ten or twenty years more left for me! But, on the whole, it has not been a mean life, measured by the common run of men; never a selfish one. Above all things else I have sought to teach the true idea of man, of God, of religion, with its truths, its duties, and its joys. I never fought for myself, or against a private foe; but have gone into the battle of the nineteenth century and followed the flag of humanity. Now I am ready to die, though conscious that I leave half my work undone.

It is true, he had other moods. His habits had been so active that he found the forced inaction of illness extremely irksome. Through many letters steals the repeated wail, "to be weak is to be miserable."

Most men dread *dying*, but not *death*. I can't think our present deaths natural, or to continue always. If something were not wrong in our mode of life we should all slide out of life as gently as old Mr. Bradlee, or your own wife; but we must bear the misfortunes which others entail upon us. If it were *fate*, it could not be borne; but when we look on it as Providence . . . we can take almost any thing with a smile. . . . These *long dyings* are terrible and unnatural. . . . O, Chev., to be weak is to be miserable, and this slow way of dying, though painless, is tormenting with its perpetual delusions and *mirages of power*, which prove nothing but idle dreams.

Such was his state, and such his views and feelings as he drew near the end. To a friend he said, a day or two before his dissolution: "Of course I am not afraid to die, but there was so much to be done." Delirium set in. He fancied himself in America and among the old friends. He was kind and considerate to all. He sent messages of affection to those he loved.

On the tenth of May, 1860, he slept in death at Florence. So gentle was his going that they scarce knew he had gone.

"His face was flushed, and the full white beard lay over the thin lips." Weiss describes the close with skill and pathos.

It would be agreeable enough to break off here this account of Parker's last days, but a little attention must be devoted to Mr. Weiss. There has been occasion before now to complain of the uncritical temper in which he accepts every statement from Parker's lips as pure gospel. It is with regret that we find him suppressing facts which are essential to a full presentation of the last hours of his hero. It was unjust in him toward Parker and unkind toward others, to print the very free comments on living persons in which that modest and urbane gentleman indulged. The remarks on the meanness of Senator Wilson on "a certain duplicity" in Horace Mann, and the reckless slurs on Mr. Beecher, had better have been spared. Still, these are merely faults in taste and manners. But Weiss drew upon Desor's sketch of Parker, in the Combe-Varin Album, for his picture of the closing scenes. Here he has been guilty of suppressing facts which are not unimportant. There has certainly been some reserve in the account of the motives which led Parker to Rome. There was a difference of opinion among the learned and experienced men whom he consulted, but none favored Rome. Parker was bent upon going thither, and no persuasion or argument availed to turn him from his purpose. He left Combe-Varin for Rome, full of hope, despite the apprehensions of his friends. He sought to persuade himself that he had done wisely in this, until the marked progress of the disease rendered hope impossible. Parker wrote at a later date to Dr. Cabot, deprecating his displeasure because he had selected Rome for a winter residence instead of Egypt. He says, "Some time I will tell you more about the reasons than I care to write." There are other hints that he feared his friends would think his course in this matter unreasonable. Six weeks before he died he wrote a letter to Desor (which Weiss skips) in these words:

ROME, March 27, 1860.

MY DEAR DESOR: Rome has not done well by me. This winter has been mild but disagreeable, rainy, windy, cloudy, fitful. I have lost three to four pounds a month since I came here. . . . *I had little confidence in Rome when I entered it, thought I would never leave it, but an inexorable fate, which I cannot tell you of more particularly, drove me on. I did not do as I would but as*

I must, and came here to receive the coup de grace which ends all my mortal troubles. I think I shall live to get home. I am content.

The rest of the letter relates to unimportant matters. It must be confessed that the lines we have underscored present Parker in a new light. Writing to a parishioner, he spoke of his affliction and probable death as "the work of an Infinite Father and Mother, who looks eternally before and eternally looks after, and rules all things from love as motive and blessedness as end." "If it were fate," he says in the same connection, "it could not be borne." The letter to Desor was written not a month later. Here it is "*an inexorable fate which drives him on*" to the end. Did Parker, then, really believe in Fate or Providence? Or had he one opinion for the philosopher with whom he corresponded and another for his parishioners? Parker knew perfectly well that this language was in direct opposition to all that he had preached and published on the subject of Providence. Yet the note to Desor seems to dilate on the notion of fate as explaining his conduct. Had a change come on in his convictions, or what had happened? This inconsistency could not fail to strike Mr. Weiss, and he thought it his duty as an impartial friend of truth to suppress it. The "Combe-Varin Album" is a rare book—not to be had of booksellers, and hence its suppression seemed safe.

Perhaps another motive influenced Weiss to shut his eyes upon the existence of this letter. He had mocked at the revival with its prayers for the conversion of Mr. Parker or his removal out of the way. His ineffectual wit, though like an unskillfully thrown boomerang, powerful and dangerous only in its recoil on the thrower, trained all its batteries upon the folly and sin of the prayer-meeting. Did Weiss fear lest such foolish people should find in Parker's statement that an inexorable fate drove him on, not letting him do as he would, but making him do as it would, and brought him to Rome to receive the *coup de grace* which was to end his earthly troubles, evidence that Heaven had heard them? Of course Parker was careless to let out his thoughts in such a way. Had Desor understood the situation as well as Weiss he never would have printed the unlucky letter. And as matters stood, what better could Weiss do than ignore its existence. Skillful Weiss!

The funeral is described in the "Life" in the following paragraph:

> On Sunday, the 13th of May, at four in the afternoon, the hour corresponding to that in which he used to stand at the desk of Music Hall, an old friend, the Rev. Mr. Cunningham, held the fitting funeral service over the body of this pure and righteous man. He read the "Beatitudes."

Adroitly managed, Mr. Weiss! Never did a writer more neatly tell the truth and conceal it in the same breath! To show the full cunning of this bit of falsehood-telling truth, the account of Desor must be cited. "On reaching Florence, drowsiness succeeded undue excitement, and, only at intervals, left him the free exercise of his noble faculties. It was in one of these rare moments, some days after our arrival at Florence, that he called me to his bedside to impart to me his last wishes respecting his burial. The funeral took place in the manner which he had prescribed. He had especially enjoined upon me, as he had previously done upon his wife, to avoid all religious ceremony. No prayer was to be offered, no funeral discourse spoken, but one of his friends was to read over his grave the verses 2–12 of the Sermon on the Mount."

Honest and simple-hearted Desor has neither the reserve, nor the fears, nor the cunning of Mr. Weiss. Who would have suspected from the account of the latter that "the fitting funeral service" consisted merely in the reading of the "Beatitudes?" Who would have dreamed that Parker had prohibited prayer, burial discourse, finally, all religious ceremony. Thus, even the Bible lesson was not a religious act. The truthfulness of Desor's account appears from the fact that, with it under his eyes, Weiss does not deny it, but so shapes his words as to agree with it without drawing attention to the actual facts.

Some months earlier Parker sent to America a programme of services to be used, in case of his death, at the public funeral in Music Hall. This is so contrary to his prescriptions at Florence that it may be as well to reprint it here:

I. Voluntary by the choir—perhaps a chant of Psa. cxxxix, 1–4, 7–12, 17, 18, 23, 24.

II. Scriptures: Micah vi, 8; Matt. xxii, 37–40; John iv, 23, 24; 1 John iii, 18–20; iv, 7, 12, 16, 18; Psa. xxiii, 1–4, 6; xxvii, 10–13; Matt. xxv, 34–40; v, 3–12.

III. A brief funeral prayer.
IV. Hymn, "While Thee I seek," etc.
V. Remarks by Wendell Phillips.
VI. Hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee."

Look at the difference between the two funerals. There was religious ceremony enough in the one at Music Hall. Why so much there and none at Florence, when both were ordered according to the directions of the deceased? In both there appears a dislike of prayers. Yet he wrote not long before to a parishioner that he liked the custom of public prayer, and would almost as soon give up the sermon as the prayer. Let Weiss explain these contradictions.

Parker wrote to a correspondent that his "Experience as a Minister must be looked on as Parker's apology for himself." A perusal of the Scriptures read at the Music Hall funeral indicates that they were meant to serve the same end. No Scriptures could be selected more fitted to produce an awful sense of human responsibility than the first two. Then come several that set forth the privilege and duty of perfect saints. Next follows the Saviour's address to the righteous in the final judgment. Last of all a passage which would seem to rank him over whom it was read with the prophets. It would be a bold thing for loving friends and disciples to read such Scriptures over the remains of the most eminent saint. There is the most startling immodesty in Parker's selecting them to be read at his funeral.

The facts which have now been brought out enable us to see Parker as he was. Upon these let him and his work be estimated.

Art. II.—THE SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

There are in the New Testament over fifty passages in which Christ is called the Son of God, and over forty in which he speaks of God as his Father—calling him not *our* Father, but *my* Father. During the apostolic age, and long after, to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God was regarded as the condition of membership in the Church, and the distinguishing characteristic of a Christian. Acts viii, 36, 37: "And the

eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*"

The question whether God has a Son was not a question in the minds of the sacred writers. In more than one hundred passages God is spoken of as the Father of Christ, or Christ is spoken of as the Son of God, in just the same way as would have been if the actual existence of a divine Son had been taken for granted without even the suggestion of a question on the subject.

What, then, is the precise import of this term, Son of God? Why was Christ called the Son of God? What is that relation between God and Christ which is indicated by this term?

1. This relation of Sonship is not founded in any event of Christ's human history, or any characteristic of his human nature, but is founded in his divine nature, and is a relation subsisting in the distinction of personality which the Scriptures teach belong to the essential nature of the divine essence. The eternal Logos is in some sense God's Son.

All intelligent beings may address God as "our Father," and they are children and brethren because of their relation to a common Creator. But Christ is God's *only* Son—a Son in a sense in which he has no brother. Christians are children of God by adoption, but Christ was never an alien. He is child and heir by natural right.

It is asserted by some that Christ is called the Son of God because of the miraculous conception, and the announcement of the angel to Mary (Luke i, 35) looks like that: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." But this theory is antagonized, first, by the fact that he was called the Son of God by many persons who could know nothing of his miraculous conception; as, for example, Nathaniel, who evidently supposed him the natural son of Joseph, but nevertheless, on receiving evidence of Christ's omniscience, addressed him, saying, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel;" second, by the fact that Christ, when defending his claims to a divine Sonship, never referred to his mirac-

ulous conception, but always to his works; and, thirdly, by the fact that results are ascribed to faith in the divine Sonship of Christ, which could not follow if Sonship had no higher import than the miraculous conception. 1 John v, 5: "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

Another theory is, that Christ's *resurrection* was the basis of his Sonship, and this theory is supported by reference to St. Paul's apparent interpretation of the Second Psalm, Acts xiii, 32, 33: "The promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." This passage, however, may be rationally interpreted by Rom. i, 3, 4: "Concerning his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead;" in which it is plain that the writer regards the resurrection as the event which "*declares*," demonstrates, that our Lord Jesus Christ, who, as to his humanity or "according to the flesh" was made of the seed of David, was, as to his divinity, "according to the Spirit of holiness," "the Son of God;" that is to say, the resurrection is not the reason why Christ is the Son of God, but the event which declares him such. Moreover, the same objections may be urged against this theory as were urged against the theory of the conception; and again, the term "*this day*," in the Second Psalm, is wholly unintelligible on either the theory of the conception or resurrection.

Another theory adopted by a large class of interpreters teaches that Christ is the Son of God because of the Messiahship. In support of this interpretation, it is alleged that the term "Son of God" is in very many passages of Scripture put in juxtaposition with terms indicating the Messiahship, in the same way as synonyms are frequently put side by side for purposes of emphasis or illustration. For example, when our Saviour inquired of his disciples, "Whom do men say that I am?" and "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." It must be conceded, first, that for all that is apparent in this passage, the terms

may be synonymous; and second, that there are very many similar passages scattered through all the New Testament writings; and third, that this interpretation ought, therefore, to be adopted, if it can be shown to be applicable in every instance where the term in question is used. But from John x, 36—"Say ye, Thou blasphemeth, because I said I am the Son of God?"—it is evident that claiming to be God's Son was, in the estimation of the Jews of Christ's time, blasphemy—a crime punishable with death by the Jewish law; but to claim to be the Messiah was no such sin. The whole people of Israel were anxiously waiting the appearance of their promised deliverer; all were ready to hail the first one showing any evidence that he was "He that should come;" many, indeed, believed on Jesus as the Messiah; but when he claimed divine Sonship, all took up stones to stone him, saying, "He is guilty of death; for, being a man, he maketh himself God, for he says, I am the Son of God." It is evident, therefore, from this text, (John x, 36,) that the terms "Messiah" and "Son of God" are not always, if ever, synonymous.

A more careful and extended consideration of this passage just now alluded to, with its connections, will, as we think, not only effectually disprove the theories above discussed, but will present a conclusive, even a determinative, argument for the position herein maintained, namely, that the term "Son of God" is a personal appellation of the pre-existent Logos—is a divine and not a human title.

From this scripture (John x, from the 24th to the 39th verse inclusive) it is evident that "the Jews who came round about him as he walked in the temple in Solomon's porch on the feast of the dedication" entertained in their thoughts not even the most distant idea of the miraculous conception or of the resurrection; and they were evidently in the same state of mind in reference to the Messiahship as were the multitude on the day of entrance into Jerusalem, who cried: "Hosanna: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." When they inquired, as recorded in the 24th verse: "How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly," they were not only willing, but were anxiously desirous, that Jesus should give them indubitable evidence that he was their expected Christ. To claim to be the Messiah was not then an

occasion of offense, much less a ground for an accusation of crime. The reply of Jesus to their question is in substance: My works show that I am the promised Christ, but I am not the Christ you expect. I am more. By your national prejudices you are disqualified to judge of my true character, or rightly to interpret the evidences of my mission. "Ye are not of my sheep." Not in mind rightly disposed toward the truth; your spiritual receptivity is depraved by your prejudices. Nevertheless, I am the true Messiah, greater than you look for. Not merely a man and a monarch, but a God-man—God manifest in the flesh. "I and my Father are one." On this announcement they took up stones to stone him, and he asking why they stoned him, they replied: "For blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, *makest thyself God.*" Let it here be distinctly marked that they accused him of blasphemy, and attempted to execute the penalty prescribed by the Jewish law for that sin, not because he claimed a miraculous conception, not because he foretold his resurrection, not because he claimed to be the Christ, but because he claimed equality and identity with God. Should it be said that this argument is weakened by the Saviour's reply in the 34th and 35th verses—"Is it not written in your law, Ye are gods? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came"—we reply that to say that herein the Saviour denies that he had claimed divinity in what he had before said, is to make his conduct in this case trifling and ridiculous; not in an ordinary sense, but supremely and contemptibly so. The obvious intent of these words is to reply to that part of the accusation against him contained in the words "*being a man;*" as if he had said "being a man" is not of itself alone conclusive argument—not decisive in a charge of blasphemy against the use of the divine title—for in Scripture the term is applied to civil rulers and religious teachers; they are called gods "to whom the word of God came." That I am a man is not of itself a determinative argument that I am not also divine. The title may be applied to a man, and the divinity signified by it be also predicated at the same time of the same man. That this is the proper exegesis of our Saviour's reply is further evident from what follows in the 37th and 38th verses, wherein he again directly reasserts his claim to a divine character by saying that by reason of his

works it was in their power to know, and was obligatory on them to believe, that "*the Father was in him, and he in the Father.*" That Jesus was understood to claim equality with the Father, and that he intended to be so understood, is evident from the fact that when he said, "The Father is in me, and I in him," they, the Jews, "therefore sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hand." Let it be distinctly noted here, that in the 36th verse our Saviour states as the sole ground on which the charge of blasphemy had been preferred against him that he had said "I am the Son of God." Remembering that blasphemy was the crime of which the Jews accused Jesus; that the blasphemy consisted in this: that he being a man made himself God, and that he did so by saying "I am the Son of God," let us turn to the account of his final trial and condemnation before the chief priests and elders of the people. Matt. xxvi, 63-66: "And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death." The record as given by Mark xiv, and also that by Luke xxii, is nearly in the same words as this quoted from Matthew. All agree in these particulars: the high priest asked, Art thou the Son of God? He answered, I am; and the whole council adjudged him therefore guilty of blasphemy and worthy of death. The same thing is yet more distinctly stated by John xix, 7, where the Jews accuse Christ before Pilate, saying, "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." Now from all this we think the conclusion resistless that, the New Testament being authority in the case, Jesus Christ was guilty of the crime of which he was accused, was justly condemned and legally executed, or he is the Son of God in a sense that makes him equal with God. That is to say, his Sonship pertains not to his human nature but to his divine nature; filiation in some sense pertains to

Deity. The distinction of persons in the Godhead is founded on something. . "The Word was with God." A relation subsists of some kind indicated by the term "with;" but relation requires plurality, and plurality necessitates characteristics by which one is distinguished from another.

Now it would seem that the above discussion sufficiently evinces that the characteristic by which the First Person in the Godhead is in Scripture distinguished from (the) others is, that it pertains to him to be a Father; and in the same way it would seem that the Second Person was chiefly, if not solely, distinguished by the fact that it pertains to him to be a Son.

2. Jesus Christ is not called the Son of God because he is the first created being, nor because he is the greatest being in the universe next to God; or, in other words, the Scripture testimony concerning Christ's sonship is not satisfactorily interpreted by either the Arian or semi-Arian theories.

Arianism seems to be an effort of the reason to sustain the unity and supremacy of God and to avoid the difficulties of the Trinity, and doubtless in many minds it accomplishes its object; but to others it is a total failure.

Though the doctrine of the Sonship be stated in the terms of the straitest of the sect of the orthodox; though it be affirmed that fecundity is as essential to Deity as omnipotence; that God has a son by the necessity of his nature; that the Father is a father by an eternal begetting, and the Son is a son by an eternal generation—even though the doctrine be stated in the strongest terms ever used—yet the statement does not to some minds present a mystery more inscrutable, or difficulties more numerous and insurmountable, than does the affirmation of a CREATED CREATOR, or a subordinate Deity. In the light of thought, a first-created being, who by delegated power becomes the creator of all existences both of matter and of mind, the creator and upholder of all that exists except God—himself the only manifestation of Deity and the object of all worship—is as unthinkable, as evidently impossible in itself, as any theory of a divine Sonship ever propounded. The whole question of Christology—indeed, the entire doctrine of the Trinity—is confessedly beyond and above the range of rational thought. Every proper investigation of these topics is, by necessity, purely exegetical. The only appropriate question is, *What say the*

Scriptures? What testimony has God given respecting himself in his word?

If Arianism be found anywhere in the Bible it is in the fifteenth verse of the first chapter of Colossians, where Christ is called the "firstborn of every creature." Let us examine this scripture. To interpret the term "firstborn" literally, would, so far forth, militate against the theory the passage is quoted to support; for that would make Christ the first BORN being, not the first MADE or created. Nothing is gained for any theory by insisting upon a literal interpretation. What then, is the sense of this term "firstborn?" There are only three passages in which this term is applied to Christ; the first is in Romans viii, 29: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the *firstborn* among many brethren;" the second is this passage under discussion, Col. i, 15: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the *firstborn* of every creature;" and the third is found in this same chapter, at the 18th verse: "And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the *firstborn* from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Now the mere reading of these passages makes it sufficiently evident that in the first and third of them pre-eminence is the idea, and the only idea, expressed by the term "*firstborn;*" and nothing is left but the manifest inference that pre-eminence is the sense of the term in the text in question. Of course the idea of *first created*, as an expression of order in time, is at once eliminated, and eliminated once for all; there is no such idea applied to Christ, no such fact affirmed of him anywhere in the word of God.

But the strength of the Arian argument lies in the expression, "*of every creature.*" This is what grammarians call a partitive genitive—a form of expression in which the person or thing spoken of is reckoned as a part of or one of the persons or things to which it stands related; that is to say, the term "firstborn of every creature," when applied to Christ, does, by the law of language in all such forms of speech, enumerate Christ among created beings. It will be seen that this argument hinges wholly on the form of the expression, which is evidently accidental and not essential. The term "every creature" is descriptive of that with which he, Christ, is compared, and only by acci-

dent or implication is it descriptive of him. Conceding to this grammatical argument all the strength to which it is entitled, we affirm that it must be deemed quite too feeble to be decisive of so grave a question as the one under consideration. Is Christ himself a created being? Certainly, if any other scripture, directly or by fair inference, teaches that Christ is uncreate, this solitary passage, putting forth at best only an implied affirmation, cannot avail so much as to terminate the discussion; but, fortunately for the cause of truth, this very passage itself, taken in its immediate connection, overwhelmingly annihilates all that can be inferred from its form of expression. Let us read the passage with its context: "Giving thanks unto the Father . . . who hath . . . translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son . . . who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: for by him, were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." We assume that by all commentators (Socinians excepted, whose exegesis we deem unworthy of notice in this connection) the category is considered exhaustive. "All things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible," describes all that has been, is, or will be, in the universe—all things, God and Christ alone excepted. We assume, too, that it is admitted that God created all these things, and now upholds, preserves them *by Christ—en auto* in him, by him, through him, and for him, they are and were created; God created the world by Christ, in the same way as he redeems the world by Christ; and the point at issue between the Arian and orthodox interpretations is this: Is the power in Christ by which he created and now upholds the universe, *in him* by delegation or inherently? We affirm the latter, and insist upon it that power to create and preserve the world is such as cannot be conferred upon a created or finite being. We have no higher idea of power than that in question. The Creator of the world is omnipotent, and omnipotence is not transferable. This passage, then, "firstborn of every creature," must not be interpreted as affirming that Christ is a created being, but as asserting his pre-eminent superiority to all created persons and things.

But may not Christ be called the Son of God because he is

the greatest being next to God, subordinate to none but God, supreme and peerless in his supremacy? May not the Scripture testimony concerning Christ be satisfactorily interpreted by predicating divinity of him, but denying essential deity? May not the essence or substance of the pre-existent Logos be *homoiousios*, *like* or similar to the essence or substance of God, but not *homooasios*, of the same essence as God?

The distinction between divinity and deity, between *a* God and *the* God, is another resort of human reason to avoid the difficulties of the Trinity; but, like every other effort of its kind, it is an utter failure. Human reason cannot bring down the infinite within its grasp. The infinite and the finite are immeasurably distant from each other, and cannot touch each other except by the condescension of the infinite. Do the Scriptures make this distinction? If not in John xiv, 28, then nowhere. Let us examine this saying of our Lord, "My Father is greater than I." Consider how much is conceded when this passage is quoted in support of semi-Arianism. Conceive any man, angel, archangel, any created being, saying soberly to his associates, "God is greater than I." What circumstances can conceivably make it necessary or appropriate for any being not God's equal to say, "God is greater than I am." The fact that Jesus uttered these words is proof that, in some sense, he and the Father are equal; the words themselves prove that in some sense the Father is greater than he. If they are not in one essence, it is not conceivable that they are equal in any sense. If it be inquired in what sense the Father is greater, perhaps no mortal can tell. The context says he is greater in a sense that makes it desirable for Christ to return to him. Christ said to his disciples, "If ye loved me ye would rejoice because I said I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I." The Father had sent him into the world to save the world. The sender in respect to the sending is greater than the sent, though in all other respects the two are equal. The begetter in respect to the begetting is greater than the begotten, though otherwise they are equal. The Father may be the source or foundation of personalities, though the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be one in essence. Plainly some distinction of inequality is conceivable that does not necessitate any idea of a distinct order of being. Christ, who said, "My Father is greater than I," also

said, "I and my Father are one;" "I am in the Father, and the Father in me;" "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also; how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?"

Formerly an argument was made from the omission of the article in the first verse of John's Gospel. We know not but now all anti-Trinitarians (Socinians, Arians, semi-Arians) have relinquished all claim to that Scripture, and are disposed rather to say they know not what that passage means than to attempt its explanation, much less derive an argument from it in favor of their theories. Probably most anti-Trinitarians of our times reject John's Gospel from the canon, deny its inspiration, and refuse to submit to its authority. But a brief notice of the ancient argument is in place here, and may be given, though modern exegesis may not require it. Translated according to the interpretation in question the passage would read: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with *the* God, and the Word was *a* God;" and this because in the second clause the original gives *ton theon*, and the third clause simply *theos*, without the article. Now reliable criticism has shown that the idiom of the Greek language does not require, if it allows, the repetition of the article before both subject and predicate unless the two terms be in every respect identical—perfectly interchangeable. If, then, the article had been repeated before *theos* in the third clause of the text, it would have asserted that God and the Word were in every respect the same. But the second clause affirms a distinction—it affirms that the Word was *with* God—and this same affirmation seems to have been of so much importance in the mind of the Spirit as to require a repetition in the succeeding verse: "The same was in the beginning with God." It would seem that the article was omitted purposely, that personality might be most distinctly set forth, while identity of essence was as distinctly declared.

3. Do the symbols of the Church rightly interpret the Scripture testimony respecting the divine Sonship? Is the Nicene doctrine of "eternal generation" taught in the word of God? Do the terms "Father," "Son," "Only begotten," and "First begotten," admit of a literal translation?

Preliminary to discussion we beg leave to say that the creeds of the Church are entitled to respect—the labors of the Fathers are not to be summarily spurned. In our times sneers are

not unfrequent. That the theologians of half a thousand years should employ the strength and energy of their lives in determining whether or not a single letter, and that the smallest in the Greek alphabet, should be rejected from a single word in the Creed of the Church, is deemed worthy of the world's contempt. But if Origenism had succeeded—if the *iota* had been admitted—if the Nicene Council had written *homoiousios* and not *homoousios*—if the Eternal Logos had been declared *a* God, and not *the* God, then the civilization of the world that would have been during these centuries had been as different from that which has been as Theism is different from Christianity. The Nicene formulas have stood an efficient and effectual bulwark and defense against heresy during the ages—they stated the unity of the divine Essence and the trinality of the divine Persons with such completeness and distinctness that the faith of the Church, with inconsiderable exceptions, has remained undivided and unshaken for more than a thousand years. But it will be said that the utility of creeds is due to the truth they contain, and is in spite of their errors; that as to the Athanasian Creed, its doctrine of eternal generation may belong to the same category as its anathemas. This, indeed; and yet we say, Not too fast! Let what deserves profound respect be profoundly and respectfully considered. But still it will be urged as an (adequate) antecedent objection that the term "eternal generation" is unintelligible: those who use it know not what they themselves intend by it.

The symbols of the Church were never formulated to improve the language of the Scriptures or to add to revelation thoughts not therein contained; much less has theological thought assumed scientific forms with the vain ambition to teach the philosophy of the divine existence or the *quo modo* of hypostatical distinctions.

The scientific formulas of the Church have originated mostly in efforts for defense against heresy; they therefore make known the truth more by informing us of what it is not, than by direct statement of what it is. This is eminently true of the topic before us. It is frequently asked, and the question insisted upon as if vital to truth, What do you mean by the generation of a personal distinction in the Deity or divine Essence? Manifestly no direct and positive answer can be given; but to

the inquirer it might be said, You are not a good theologian to ask the question. The terms "Trinity," "Three Persons in one God," present to thought that which has no analogy in the whole compass of human knowledge; and manifestly whatever be the immanent and ineffable activities by which personal distinctions have existence, herein more than anywhere else lies the heart of the Trinitarian mystery. This objection, that the term suggests that which is unthinkable, if admitted, is a bar to all discussion on the subject: it is equivalent to an affirmation that it is impossible for man to formulate any idea of a personal distinction in the Godhead; that is, the whole idea of a Trinity, whether true or false, is unrevealable. Men do not thus reason in respect to other topics. If a Traducian were asked, How are souls propagated? he could not answer; must he, therefore, have no faith in traducianism? He does not, he cannot, believe in pre-existence nor in creationism; he does believe that souls are begotten.

Dr. Edward Beecher, in a recent article in the *Christian Union*, revives what was thought to be an exploded theory by suggesting that generation may be eliminated from the creed, because the terms "*first* begotten" and "only begotten," which occur but few times—and that in the writings of John—may be rendered "*well beloved*," and that possibly these terms, together with "Father" and "Son," are used in the Scriptures only to set forth that there is an infinite affection perpetually subsisting and reciprocal between the Persons of the Trinity. This may be so, but to our mind the term *loved* is a very unnatural rendering of the word "begotten" in the Second Psalm, and, moreover, nothing is gained by this interpretation, since it is, to say the least, as difficult to see how affection can be the ground of distinction, as it is to apprehend the theory rejected.

Again, perhaps by way of objection to the Creed, or possibly to propose a new theory, it is sometimes said that the terms under discussion are used simply to indicate the *fact* of a trinity; that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are spoken of as each possessing personal characteristics, together with divine attributes, to reveal the *fact* that God, immutably one as to essence, subsists in a manner that admits of the personal distinctions I, thou, he, without attempting to intimate what may

be the ground of distinction or the manner of its subsistence. That is to say, there is no revelation on the topic we discuss: man does not know, and cannot know, why Jesus Christ is called the Son of God.

To be dogmatically positive on such a subject is unseemly; we therefore say, It may be so; and yet we assume that the Trinity was revealed for a purpose, and that it is legitimate to inquire what that revelation is; and, as far forth as it is possible, to exhaust its contents, that the purpose of its giving may be more surely secured. We have ventured an investigation, the result of which is in present conviction as follows:

The free and abundant use of the terms "Father" and "Son;" their use without qualification or explanation, without embarrassment or any implied doubt or difficulty, and the occasional use of the terms "*begotten*," "*first begotten*," and "*only begotten;*" the use of these terms and (none) others, whenever the relation between God and Christ is referred to, certainly suggest that they are used in a natural and not in a metaphorical sense, and seem to impose the obligation to accept in faith the idea generically, modifying it only by such limitations and restrictions as the nature of the case requires. Of course generation, as applied to the spiritual and the infinite, must of necessity be differentiated in very many particulars—from generation as applied to the material and the finite. That it may be so differentiated, and yet generically applied to both, is, to say the least, quite conceivable, and we submit that in the absence of any expressed, or plainly implied, scriptural authority for regarding these terms metaphorically, *we are bound to receive them in their literal signification.*

A firm belief in the essential Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ may be all that is requisite to the completeness of Christian faith; but to us, in the light of consciousness, a firm conviction that Jesus Christ is God's Son, in a literal and proper sense, forms a broader, firmer foundation for Christian faith than any other conviction known to our thought. If we believe this, then the exceeding sinfulness and infinite peril of sin, the adequacy of atonement to all the necessities of the race, and all other doctrines needful and useful for salvation, are readily and easily believed.

Art. III.—CARL IMMANUEL NITZSCH.

Of the many earnest men who have wrought profoundly and fruitfully, during the past half century, upon the whole field of that highest of all sciences, theology, none stands in so many respects so high as Nitzsch. On learning of his death, M. de Pressensé wrote:

> Germany has lost, in Nitzsch, the most eminent of the disciples of Schleiermacher. In many points he has improved the incomplete thought of his master. An original and profound thinker, and with a Christian character almost ideal in its disinterestedness, serenity, and broad and sympathetic piety, he leaves to posterity the purest and noblest of reputations. His name, with that of Neander, symbolizes the fruitful union of a vast and liberal erudition with a fervent and devout piety.

Twelve years before his death, Dr. Schaff appreciated him thus:

> Of all the German divines still living, there is none who carries with him so much moral weight in his personal appearance as Dr. Nitzsch. . . . He moves like a patriarch, combining the present generation with the age of Schleiermacher and Neander, among the professors, ministers, and students of Berlin. He has probably more personal influence upon the student than any of his colleagues. . . . He bows before the Scriptures with a reverential mind, as the unerring word of the living God, and brings to light many precious pearls from its secret treasures. He represents the progress of the Schleiermacherian system to biblical theology.

In preaching his funeral sermon, Dr. Hoffmann, of Berlin, his tried friend and official associate, said:

> Nitzsch was, and continued throughout life, a man of fidelity in faith, of earnestness in life, of clearness in thought, and of comprehensive love in the harmonizing of all such as stand upon, and desire to hold fast to, the eternal rock Christ Jesus. Hence his knowledge grew into wisdom, and he stood as a Christian sage before the young generation, and shone as a bright light before the rising world of his many disciples from all Germanic lands. The ardent glow of his heart continued till the last to dispel the darkness and gloom from many troubled souls. How near he stood to the members of his Berlin Church, is evidenced by profound impressions written in many hearts; and how often a single word from him answered the deepest longings of a soul we know from personal experience. However high in the thought-world of Christian truth he was wont to dwell, he was yet always

ready and capable of coming down and kindly discoursing of spiritual things heart to heart with whoever desired it. . . . And his long life has been richly fruitful both here in Berlin and in a much wider circle, rich in the noblest fruits of righteousness and wisdom, of knowledge and spiritual power. No one could even look into his noble, venerable countenance without receiving the impression of a man mighty through Christian wisdom, and before whom even those were constrained to do inner homage who had long since lost all feelings of reverence for the holy. We, however, to whom he stood in nearer relations, can all of us look back upon his now closed earthly life with the greatest satisfaction and with glad thankfulness, as upon a completed work of divine grace, as upon the life of an entire man.

In view of such appreciations, may we not safely presume that a rapid sketch of the earthly career of this recently-departed evangelical patriarch will be worthy of the attention of the American Church? The necessary material lies ready before us: first, an exhaustive "Memorial Essay," by his former pupil, Dr. Beyschlag, in the *Studien und Kritiken* of Oct., 1869; second, a "Life Sketch," by Dr. Hoffmann; and, third, the "Memorial Sermon," preached by Dr. Hoffmann, Sept. 21, 1868, in the Church of St. Nicholas, Berlin. Dr. Beyschlag writes under the inspiration of vivid memories from his student-days at Bonn, when he received from Nitzsch, then in the noonday of his strength, a fructifying initiation into the gold-mines of a genuine and worthy theology. Dr. Hoffmann writes and preaches under the influence of a long, harmonious, official association with him in the guidance of the Prussian Church during his riper and declining years. The former presents him more as a scientific theologian and teacher; the latter more as a Church-father and ripely developed Christian.

In the light of these reliable helps, and of some slight personal knowledge of him as a teacher and preacher, we proceed to sketch the outlines of his career.

Carl Immanuel Nitzsch saw the light for the first time in the mother-land of the German Reformation, Sept. 21, 1787. His father was at this time Church superintendent in the Saxon town Borna, near Leipzig. Some years later he was called to Wittenberg as professor and Church superintendent, where he lived and labored until 1831. Carl Immanuel was set apart from infancy for the priestly office. Until his sixteenth year he received instruction in the paternal house, and became in

fact the favorite of his father and of the whole family. He was now placed in the best of the many classical schools of Saxony, at Pforta. Here he soon became a general favorite, not only because of his extraordinary physical beauty, but also because of the moral nobleness of his nature, and of his solid and rapid acquirements in knowledge. He became so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Latin literature that he felt more at home in the language of Cicero than in his mother-tongue. In later years he bitterly regretted this neglect of his vernacular, and attributed to his too exclusive absorption in the classics the insuperable heaviness of his German style. Even till the end of life he wrote and spoke Latin as readily and elegantly as German. His one-sided classical training, however, was not without great advantage. It laid a broad foundation for a wise and harmonious life. The golden utterances of the Greek poets and philosophers were throughout life as familiar to him as proverbs.

It may well be supposed that when the nineteen-year-old Nitzsch returned from his four years' immersion in the classic atmosphere of Pforta, in order to begin his University course at Wittenberg, the theology of the day would have but little attraction for him. In fact, he became for a time unsettled as to whether his life-calling lay not rather in the direction of philosophy. The writings of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling were now absorbing the thoughts of all, and shaking the foundations of hereditary beliefs. Nitzsch plainly saw that the old, stiff supernaturalism of the past could not stand before the storm of new thought. He felt that the confessional orthodoxy of his father, and the growing rationalism of the Church in general, could no longer go hand in hand. But his momentary hesitation before the storms that seemed to be brewing on all sides of the theological horizon was soon overcome and dispelled under the influence of a few faithful Christian teachers at Wittenberg. The pious Heubner, and, at a later period, Tzschirner, succeeded in awakening in him a zest for dogmatics, patristics, and Church history. But his real initiator into theology was his own father. This man was an earnest, independent thinker, who attempted to reconcile the new Kantian ethics with old, strict, Lutheranism. To this meditating stand-point many young men owed their first dawnings of satisfaction in

the "confused contest between palæology and neology." This was the theological position of the young Nitzsch until his twenty-second year. It was only on occasion of the criticism of his examination sermon, by the celebrated Reinhard of Dresden, that he was made conscious of the untenableness and inner disharmony of this position.

Between the elder and the younger Nitzsch there was, however, an essential difference. The father was a vigorous abstract thinker; the son was not only this, but had also a deeply mystic turn which was foreign to his father. The father belonged to the rational tendency that went out from Lessing and Kant; the son moved in the higher spiritual realm, represented by Schiller and Goethe in poetry, the Schlegels, Tieck, and Novalis in criticism, Fichte, Schelling, and Fries in philosophy, and De Wette and Schleiermacher in religion. Especially the works of the latter powerfully revolutionized his inner life, and led him further than ever from the merely formal orthodoxy of his father. It is characteristic of the relations of the two that the father expressed himself as not only having the greatest delight in his son, but also as feeling toward him a sort of involuntary *reverence.*

After three years of university study, Nitzsch prepared an elaborate Latin dissertation "On the Use and Abuse of the Apocryphal Gospels in Elucidating the Canonical Books," and was examined on the symbolical books and passed into the state of candidacy for the Church. Soon thereafter (June 16, 1810) he began his academic career as *Privatdocent* of theology at the University of Wittenberg. His Latin dissertation on the occasion "On the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" brought him still further into public notice. His mystico-practical spirit was not content with serving the Church in so distant a relation as that of a mere teacher. Hence he applied for and obtained the position of fourth deacon at the University Church, and was ordained for the office by his father in 1811.

In this office he was soon to meet with severe trials, which contributed not a little to the inner maturity of his spiritual life. The military movements in 1813, when the star of Napoleon was on its rapid decline, brought great sufferings upon the town of Wittenberg. It was a strong military point, and was often taken and re-taken in the desperate struggle. Being held

at this time by the French, it was several times bombarded by the gathering hosts of rising Germany, and was finally taken by storm Jan. 13, 1814. Months previously the *personnel* of the university had left the place. One half of the population had also fled, while upon the remainder the terrors of war, famine, and pestilence abundantly fell. During these long months Heubner, and the young Nitzsch were the only pastors that remained to care for the suffering flock, and in a right evangelical manner they performed their task. Forty years subsequently, Nitzsch prepared a vivid picture of his experiences at the time. For many days murderous bombs and fire rockets rained upon the doomed town. Only in cellars was life safe. Churches were turned into magazines or citadels. Worship was possible only in a private lecture-room. But here the two pastors preached almost hourly, and administered the sacraments to crowding multitudes. More than once Nitzsch rescued with his own hand the paternal house and the beloved cathedral-church from the already kindled fire. And in visiting the hospitals where the deadliest forms of disease were raging, he was undaunted and unwearied. Almost every day he made a round in the narrow lanes and alleys, bearing bread and other necessaries under his priestly garb to the poor and wretched, and administering words of Christian consolation to Catholics and Protestants, to friend and foe. Thus his lively participation in the sufferings of his father-land found no inefficient factor in developing in the young theologian that richness of practical experience and broadness of sympathy which were admired in him throughout his eventful career.

But the passing away of the war-cloud did not immediately place him into satisfactory relations. The churches and the city lay desolate, and almost in ruins. Pestilence still raged. The transferance of his Saxon father-city to the scepter of Prussia was a severe trial for his Saxon heart. Moreover, the beloved university never returned, so that his academic career was interfered with at its very outset. Limited to his subordinate pastorate, he devoted himself, in this "undesired leisure," to theological studies, and published in 1816, as the first-fruit of the same, a dogmatic historical disquisition on the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity. This paper presents its author as deeply involved in the theological movement excited by

Schelling, but yet as maintaining a quite independent position in the face of the philosophical theology of the day. Though giving full appreciation to the dogma of the Trinity, and entering freely into speculations upon it, he yet finds the anchor-point of Christianity not in speculative dogmas, but in the person of the sinless and therefore the anthropic Redeemer. The ground-thought of the dissertation is to show that the Christian "theogony" widely differs from the physical or logical theogony of the non-Christian systems, (with which it was then fashionable to place it in the same rank,) as being essentially ethical. Thus we see Nitzsch at the very outset of his career making his definite choice between the two currents which then began in the field of theology, namely, between the logical-speculative one of Hegel, and the dialectico-mystical one of Schleiermacher.

The year 1817 finally brought a settled condition of things to Wittenberg. Though the university was given to Halle, a theological faculty was still granted to the old mother-city of the Reformation. At the head of the newly-organized seminary stood the elder Nitzsch as director, and beside him Schleusner, Heubner, and the younger Nitzsch. These solid men entered now with fresh alacrity upon their learned work. This same year, the three hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, brought to Nitzsch the seal of his scientific calling, the theological doctorate, which the Berlin faculty conferred upon him during Schleiermacher's rectorate, doubtless on the ground of his dissertation on the Trinity. The new professorship of the young doctor was quite to his taste; it perfectly satisfied his tendency to unite scientific with practico-churchly interests, so characteristic of his whole life. His chief duty here, to lecture on Church history, gave him occasion for profound studies in the life of the Church of the past; he also expounded the orations of Demosthenes and of St. Chrysostom, and took part in conducting the exercises in homiletics and catechetics. And he still continued his active pastorate, and aided his father in the general superintendency.

The following year (June 24) brought the professor of one-and-thirty, who had thus far sat at his father's table, a fireside of his own. Emilie Schmieder, the daughter of a noted educator, became his life-companion, and lived with him in an unu-

sually happy wedlock for a half century—until the close of his life. His marriage, however, did not loosen his attachment to the parental house, and he declined flattering calls to Leipzig and to Greifswald in order not to forego his happy associations. His twofold office, however, began to make inroads on his health. An affection of the breast necessitated a visit to a watering-place in 1819, and finally induced him to ask for a lighter office. He obtained a pastorate at Kemberg, near Wittenberg, and there entered upon the cure of souls in his earnest and winning but rather retiring manner. While here, he was called to a professorship at Königsberg, but declined it. In the summer of 1821, however, when solicited to a theological professorship in connection with the office of university-preacher at the young University of Bonn, his former love for the academic life awoke so strongly that he overcame all obstacles, and betook himself to this new and distant field of labor.

There is no question but that this going to Bonn was one of the happiest steps of Nitzsch's whole life. It threw him out of the rather confined professional and confessional environment in which he had thus far moved, and transplanted him into the influence of very different Church-traditions and into close association with a circle of gifted minds, such as Lücke, Sack, Augusti, Bleek, Niebuhr, Ernst, Moritz, Arndt, Brandis, etc., which could not fail of a very fructifying influence upon his further development. But notwithstanding this great transition, from strict though somewhat rationistically affected Lutheranism to the presbyterially-constituted Reformed Church, from the old center of German Protestantism to a frontier post in constant conflict with a vital and imposing Catholicism, from strictly confessional habits to the freer and less churchly spirit of Pietism—Nitzsch remained, from the first to the last, true to himself, and simply received an impetus to a fuller and rounder development of tendencies that were already in him.

His new professorship called him principally to lecture on systematic theology, and thus necessitated him to a complete development of his theological ground-views. Schleiermacher's "Dogmatics," which appeared about this time, was manifestly his principal help in this work. Wherever he had occasion to express himself literarily we see him going back to this work

and presenting his own views as a further development or modification of the same. It is true, he was also deeply interested in the antagonistic speculative theology of the Hegelian school, mainly, however, only as opposing it. Though by no means satisfied with the results of Schleiermacher, Nitzsch saw and showed clearly, that the seemingly much more positive results of the Hegelian "Theo-logic" rested upon an entirely delusive foundation; whereas the principle of Schleiermacher positively safeguarded the interests of the Christian faith. While Schleiermacher found the roots of religion in the sphere of the immediate consciousness, in feeling, the speculative school regarded feeling only as the imperfect embryo stage of the idea. Nitzsch took up his position in the midst of this antithesis, though much nearer to Schleiermacher than to Hegel, and this position formed the starting-point of that entire and peculiar theoretical theology which called forth from Schleiermacher as early as 1830 the flattering utterance that Nitzsch was the theologian by whom he most preferred to be either praised or blamed. Nitzsch opposed, with telling effect, to the speculative Hegelian school, that while the "pious feeling" embraces the spiritual life in its totality, the boasted "idea" which presumed to absorb or do away with this feeling is but one phase of the spiritual life, and a phase which by no means comprehends the full contents of religious feeling; in other words, that the "idea" is capable of becoming neither will nor experience, and hence can neither sanctify nor happify. By this course, the mere intellectualism of the speculative Hegelian school, which saw in religious faith only a "notion" of divine things which required to be clarified into an "idea," but not a life-relation to God, and which thus gave occasion to the astounding deception that to have absolute knowledge and to have eternal life is simply one and the same thing, was assailed in its fountain-head, and a religion theory definitively condemned, "which left it in doubt whether a lauding seraph does not occupy a—because less scientific, hence—lower stage than a speculative Satan." While, therefore, Nitzsch held with Schleiermacher that feeling is not merely the preliminary form, but the essential contents of the religious spirit-life, yet he was by no means satisfied with Schleiermacher's limiting of this feeling as relating to the spheres of thought and volition. On the contrary, he emphat-

ically insisted that feeling, as the immediate unity and totality of the spirit-life, essentially involves in itself both reason and will, idea and conscience, so that consequently there springs up in religious feeling both an immediate knowledge and a corresponding will-impulse.

From this stand-point Nitzsch was enabled to develop essentially further the Schleiermacherian theology without at all sacrificing its underlying principles. He repeatedly blames in this theology the absence of the idea of the divine Word and the exclusion of the "gnostic" elements of the Christian faith, (the Trinity, etc.) These defects his own stand-point enabled him to remedy. It being essential to the religious feeling to involve in itself religious ideas, religious ground-truths, hence Christian religiosity could not rest merely upon the life-stream that went out from Christ, but it must be based upon a Word of God that witnesses of Christ, and which is hence the objective norm for the subjective faith-knowledge.

This same fundamental view which gave to Nitzsch's theology its Biblico-speculative character, was also the source of another not less important peculiarity of the same, namely, its *ethico*-dogmatical tendency. The religious feeling being not only idea and immediate knowledge, but also proto-will or conscience, hence his system recognized scientifically and in its psychological roots the inseparable connection between religion and morality, as given both in the Christian consciousness and in the Holy Scriptures. Thus his ground-principle promised the greatest clarification and fertilization of the two sciences, in that each was to be studied in the light of the other,—in that dogmatics and ethics were to be considered in their fountain-unity and mutual conditionment, and in that thus only would it clearly appear that nothing can belong to the Christian faith which is not a motive to moral purification and perfection, and that nothing can be truly moral which is not a fruit of Christian faith. In thus treating of dogmatics ethically and of ethics dogmatically, Nitzsch overcame, from a more positive and more biblical stand-point than Schleiermacher, the one-sidedness of the old dogmatistic and moralistic stand-point in both sciences.

It is well known that from this thought of a mutual interpenetration of dogmatics and ethics sprang Nitzsch's chief

work in the field of theoretical theology, his System of Christian Doctrine."* This work appeared first in 1829 as a slender outline, then in an enlarged form in 1833, and between then and 1851 in four further editions, constantly growing in completeness and richness. Christian doctrine is here presented from the central idea of *salvation* in Christ in its dogmatico-ethical unity, in that it is argued from the fact of salvation to the necessary pre-suppositions thereof, namely, original good and actual evil. And thus is developed from ground-principles which are equally ethical and dogmatical the doctrine of God and man, of sin and death, and of the foundation, the appropriation, the communion and the consummation of salvation. The constant aim of the work is to present Christian doctrine in its prototypal Biblical form as a normative basis for a criticism and clarification of the creed of the Church. Of great significance is the speculative basis of the work as presenting the author's peculiar religion-conception, in that he here presents in a clear light the essential difference between natural and revealed religion, and thus has occasion to present his conception of prophecy and of miracles, of the Word of God and of the Holy Scriptures—an outline of the science of religion in which is presented very distinctly, though unfortunately too laconically, the important improvements made by the author upon the ground-principle of Schleiermacher.

This essential inseparableness of dogmatics and ethics is a prime characteristic of the entire theological activity of Nitzsch. And he was rejoiced to see in later years, in the "Ethics" of Rothe and in the "Dogmatics" of Liebner, evidence that his labors in this direction had not been fruitless.

It is a peculiarity of Nitzsch's theoretical theology that, unlike his practical theology, it does not presume to present strictly definitive results but rather that it throws open, both on the side of exegesis and on that of speculation, broad paths that may be followed out almost infinitely. The scanty statement of his systematic dogmatics is, however, happily complemented by a large series of special essays on particular points of doctrine, which he abundantly scattered in the theological journals of the day, but more especially in the *Studien und Kritiken*, in the founding of which, in 1828, he lent a helping hand to Ullmann,

* System der Christlichen Lehre, 6 Auf., 1851.

and Umbreit. In this journal he repeatedly appeared as the interpreter and apologist of Schleiermacher, and some of the essays thus contributed are of an epoch-making character. Worthy of separate mention are: His celebrated paper on the Immanent Trinity (1841), in which the peculiar Biblico-speculative position which distinguished Nitzsch both from the Schleiermacherian and from the Hegelian school, is strikingly manifest; also, his celebrated "Protestant Reply to the Symbolik of Möhler," and his "Theological Criticism of the Dogmatics of Strauss." The answer to Möhler was a scientific feat of great brilliancy. It reduced the ingeniously distorted antithesis of Catholicism and Protestantism, as presented by Möhler, to the simple antithesis of a legally-distorted and evangelically-purified Christianity, and thus furnished a very significant norm for the new science of symbolics. With the same calm masterliness of manner, he showed the utter superficiality and baselessness of the criticism of Strauss, and contrasted therewith the impregnability of the bases of Christianity, especially of the idea of miracles and of revelation.

Important, however, as were these literary labors, they were of but minor significancy when compared with his gigantic labors in oral instruction. Though lecturing only on the main branches of theology, his auditors yet felt that he dominated the whole field with almost equal masterliness. Important among his lectures was that on the theological encyclopedia, in which he distinguished theology into fundamental, historical, systematic, and practical, and then sketched each branch with equal virtuosity. His great strength, however, was displayed in the special field of dogmatics and ethics, in the treatment of which he traversed almost the entire field of theology. Though holding no exegetical lectures proper, his biblical-theology constituted, for this very reason, an all the greater and more systematic introduction into the Scriptures. He took pride in having first introduced this favorite subject into the circle of university lectures. He treated it as a sort of history of dogmas inside of the Bible, distributing its subject-matter into a patriarchial, a Mosaic, a prophetic, a Judaistic, a Messianic, and an apostolic stage. By taking into account, under the guidance of a sound criticism, the course of history as an essential condition of the development of doctrine, he strengthened his pupils against the seductions of an over-

presuming criticism, and taught them to honor and appreciate the Old Testament as well as the New. His systematic theology, however, was based not less upon exegetical than upon historical studies; of this, his lectures on the history of dogmas and on the symbolical books gave abundant evidence. A special course of lectures on the history of recent dogmatics gave him occasion to introduce his hearers into the wide sea of modern conflicting elements. In all of these lectures the hearer knew not which most to admire, the erudition or the keen penetration of the man, his comprehensive philological, historical, philosophical culture, or the mystico-speculative energy wherewith he transformed the entire subject-matter into spirit and life. The greatest magic, however, lay neither in the one nor in the other, but in the personality of the teacher himself, in his winning earnestness, in his spontaneously outbeaming inner nobleness, in the vital impression of a character sanctified by the truth, which was irresistibly felt by whoever came into his presence.

Dr. Beyschlag, who studied under Nitzsch several years (after 1840) when he was in the meridian of his glory, gives some interesting items of his personal experience at the time. The faculty at Bonn enjoyed then its greatest popularity. Theological students, from eighty to a hundred, flocked to Bonn from all parts of Germany. Fully one half of them were from distant parts, especially from Holstein and from Switzerland, and had come expressly to hear Nitzsch, for he was in fact not only the pearl of his faculty, but also of the whole university. A student of medicine pointed him out to Beyschlag, in a crowded street, as the object of universal respect. In his lecture-room, however, it was hardly possible for the beginner to feel comfortably at first; whoever came to a lecture of Nitzsch without a preliminary theological training was apt to feel somewhat as a little child when vacantly staring at a conversation of earnest men. It was only gradually, after having grown accustomed to his peculiar form of expression, and attained to some familiarity with theological literature, especially with Schleiermacher, that the student rose to a more than verbal understanding of him. This period once passed, however, a rich stream of the highest spiritual enjoyment broke in upon him. Nitzsch's delivery was animated and free, devoid

of all rhetoric, and yet without serious faults of form. The stream of thought moved forward in quiet majesty, and sprang evidently fresh from the inner new-creating activity of the spirit. His polemics were always calm and dignified, and sometimes seasoned with a pleasantry, but never with a joke. The earnestness of the treatment corresponded to the earnestness of the matter; and though the teaching never sank below the strictness of science to become edificatory in the usual sense, he was yet listened to not only with absorbed attention, but also with real devotion.

But Nitzsch's profound mastery of science was united with the greatest devotion to the interests of the Church also in its practical aspects. Herein he strictly resembled Schleiermacher. In his eyes theology, though the noblest of sciences, was yet simply a handmaid of the Church, and practical theology the crown of the theological sciences. The training of his students in practical theology was throughout his life a favorite phase of his labors as teacher. The climax of his activity was his faithful guidance of the homiletical seminary. Here his Christain conscientiousness shone forth under the most admirable forms. Here the young candidates for the ministry were admitted into a still closer communion with the warm life of his great heart. A father himself could not have cared and labored for them with more painstaking devotion.

And what the seminary furnished in the form of instruction, that the university-worship presented in the form of the most wholesome practical example. In the purest sense of the word, no divine service could be more solemn than this. Even unbelieving Catholic students could not resist the impression that Nitzsch possessed the divine presence to an extraordinary degree. As to his sermons, their charm was not in their rhetoric but in the richness of their substance, and in the irresistible impression they made of springing out of the inner depths of a God-inspired heart. The preacher's manner was very calm and self-possessed, rather meditating than orating—unfolding the depths of the Scriptures, and rendering transparent the tortuosities of the human heart.

His office of university preacher formed the connecting link to a profound and wide-reaching ecclesiastical influence, which did not fall far behind his professorial activity in importance. The Church of the Rhine Provinces was, at the time of his labors at

Bonn, in an unsettled state of transition. Upon the harmonizing of its discordant elements into a better consistency Nitzsch was powerfully influential. In this work he disdained not the humblest and most wearying forms of labor, entering into the minutest details of administration, and taking part with the ordinary pastors in the incidental week-day and vacation services. In the provincial synods he was among the most laborious and honored members. His voice was ever heard on the side of moderation and harmony. Here as elsewhere throughout his life he zealously worked for the promotion of the project—initiated Sept. 27, 1817—of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Prussia into an organic whole. His devotion to this idea created for him hosts of friends, but also some hot-headed enemies. These latter did what they could to thwart his influence, and in fact succeeded in making him misunderstood by many sincere friends.

His earnest championship of the Church-union, together with his general great ability, gradually fixed the eyes of all upon him as the acknowledged leader of the movement. This reputation was the more immediate cause of his call to Berlin, in 1847, to take the Chair of Dogmatics, left vacant by the death of Marheineke. This was the tenth call with which Nitzsch had been honored by the Universities of Germany.

It was a severe trial to break away from his charming home on the Rhine, and especially from his cherished university associations of twenty-five years' standing. But he felt it his duty to go. Just as his friends were preparing for him a congratulatory festival on the accomplishment of this period of labor, fell upon them the painful news that this labor was now to cease, and the intended season of congratulation was changed into a no less imposing, but sadder, one of farewell. Students, clergy, and citizens vied with each other in testimonials of respect and gratitude, and of sorrow at his departure.

When Nitzsch arrived in Berlin, in the spring of 1847, he was in his sixtieth year, and nearly twenty years of vigorous life stood before him. His quietest and happiest life had been at Bonn. The years now before him were no less full of usefulness and devotion to the Church, but they were attended with many incidents of perplexity and opposition which weighed heavily upon his heart. The hearers that thronged his lect-

ure-room were indeed more numerous than at Bonn; he also still enjoyed his beloved office of university-preacher, and stood at the head of a homiletical seminary. But the ecclesiastical horizon became threatening; and the political convulsions of 1848 made themselves threateningly foreseen.

When the storm really broke out, however, no man passed through it more calmly than Nitzsch. On the morning after its fiercest outbreak, when a lawless populace was omnipotent, he was among the very few preachers who dared to hold a service. To a hesitating congregation he expounded, and applied to the events of the day—more praying than preaching, as he afterward said—the significant words: "If a man strive for masteries, yet he is not crowned except he strive lawfully." And during the convulsive months that followed, Nitzsch gave other ample proofs of the virtue of Christian courage. He never for a moment lost his steadfast confidence in the Church and in the Word of God. This stormy year, 1848, placed him as rector at the head of the university. In the execution of this office he was more than once in imminent personal danger. The passionate revolutionary spirit of the populace shook the capital to its center, and repeatedly threatened to break into the university and render it the theater of all manner of lawlessness. Nitzsch offered manful resistance to these dangers, and did not hesitate, unpopular as it then was, to call in, on occasion, the help of armed force. Among many incidents it is mentioned that on one occasion a violent multitude of students were assembled in the aula of the university, tumultuously discussing the political events of the day. Nitzsch went into the assembly and commanded, as rector, the dissolution of the unauthorized meeting. A storm of the wildest uproar immediately broke out, and seemed ready to dash upon his venerable head. It passed over, however, and not a hand was laid upon him.

He closed his rectorate, in the summer of 1849, under more peaceful auspices, and gave expression, in an oration on the ecclesiastical significancy of the reign of Frederick William III., to hopes of a regeneration of the father-land, under the leadership of Prussia, which seemed for awhile destined to definitive disappointment. Nitzsch was not a political liberal in the extreme sense, but yet his entire religious and ethical nature protested against the absolutistic theocratism in State and

Church which came into vogue as soon as the smoke of mad revolutionary passion cleared away. Consequently he and a number of other truly weighty men broke off from the great conservative party and erected in a journal * of their own the banner of a wise and politic moderation. This course brought him into bad odor with the administrative beaurocracy of the moment. As an offset to this ill-will from head-quarters, the people elected Nitzsch twice to represent them in the Chamber. Here he pleaded the cause of prudent and conservative progress.

While under the momentary cloud of unpopularity, a tempting offer came to solicit him back to his former and beloved associations of the Rhine, but he felt it his duty to remain at his present post. The tide of ecclesiastical reaction kept pace with the political. To stem the tide of confessional Neo-Lutheranism, Nitzsch, in co-operation with Julius Müller and Neander, established a journal † in 1850, which did valiant service for the cause of genuine Christian principles.

In the mean time, however, the great practical scheme of Nitzsch's life, the Prussian Church-union, seemed to be losing ground and destined to shipwreck. In 1852 it had been managed to procure an order from the king directing the ecclesiastical boards to divide themselves into Lutheran and Reformed sections, thus annulling the union within itself. All the members of the upper-church council conformed to this order except Nitzsch alone. When the question was put to him, he declared that he belonged to both of the confessions, that is, to their *consensus*, and hence that he would have to belong to both of the sections or to neither. This manly position of Nitzsch set a check to the dissolution of the union, and inspired new hope in its discouraged friends.

Ever since he had left Bonn, Nitzsch had been employing all the leisure moments he could command in completing his second literary work, his "Practical Theology." ‡ Also his practical labor of teaching was continued at the university. He was now to take upon himself still another weighty office. The position of provost at the Churches of St. Nicolas and St. Mary—the

* Das Preussische Wochenblatt.

† Deutsche Zeitschrift für chr. Wissenschaft und chr. Leben.

‡ Praktische Theologie.

office of chief pastor at the head of seven deacons—had become vacant. Public opinion pointed to Nitzsch as the fit man to assume the office which the venerated Spener had once filled. The Government yielded to the current, and Nitzsch was appointed. He was inducted into the new office June 24, 1855. No higher honor could have fallen to him: it was an office of great dignity and little necessary labor. The law provided for the appointment of an extra deacon, to whom he might have confided all the real labor of the position. Nitzsch, however, undertook himself all the duties of the place, and still retained his place in the upper consistory, and also his professorship; and, though in his sixty-ninth year, he went to work in his threefold office with all the enthusiasm of youth. It is true, he did not gather around his pulpit at St. Nicolas a thronged audience. The peculiar profundity of his sermons overreached the receptivity of his non-academic society; and his voice did not long continue sufficient for the roomy Gothic building. An elect number, however, learned to appreciate his pulpit, and experienced again the inexhaustible charm which had wrought so potently at Bonn. His university-lectures retained their primitive freshness, and were now delivered entirely without manuscript. With the ripening of his theological development, they had gradually become his own free possession. A fine specimen of these lectures ("On Christian Doctrine for Students of all the Faculties,") he permitted to be published, in 1859, by a friend who had written down an exact copy of them. During the same decade he delighted the public with quite a number of popular addresses on vital topics.

In the year 1857, the seventieth of his age, the ecclesiastical horizon seemed considerably to brighten. The reactionary policy of Stahl ceased to control the Church, and a peaceful and healthy development began to take place. Though his favorite project, the Prussian Church-union, seemed slow of realization, he was surprised and delighted to greet the morning dawn of its essential elements in an unexpected form and on a scale encircling the whole earth, in the Evangelical Alliance. He also lived to see the Prussian Church-diet shake off the confessional tendency that had been forced upon it. And the date, June 16, 1860, the congratulation-day of his fifty years of university labor, brought to him from far and near abun-

dant evidence of how evangelical Germany honored in him the *preceptor Germaniæ* of the time being.

For some time beyond his seventieth year Nitzsch felt no consciousness of being old. Now, however, his vigor and vision began to give way. It was an ill-advised thought to heap now upon the already threefoldly burdened patriarch of seventy-six the duties of the Berlin Church superintendency. But to help the authorities out of an embarrassment he cheerfully undertook them. This proved too much for him. One after another he had to give up his lectures. In 1865 and '66 he was able to attend Church conferences at Halle, though in great feebleness. He hoped yet to prepare for the press his Biblical Theology, but he found not the strength. Most of all was he anxious to complete his Practical Theology.

This work had been the favorite of his life. He had begun it more than twenty years in the past. It was to contain the rich fruit of a long life of churchly study and experience. It was to be his testament to the Evangelical Church and to its ministers. In the first volume he discusses the idea, history, method, and classification of the science, then the churchly life in its idea, (the basis of this life, its expressions, and its relations to the other human societies,) the principles of this life in the past and in the present, and in its antithesis to Romanism, and finally the confessional differences in the Evangelical Church, and the signs of its rejuvenation and rapid future development. It is only after laying this magnificent basis that he proceeds organically to construct the science in its several parts. These parts fully answered the great expectations which the first part had awakened. The volumes followed each other in 1848, '51, '57, '67. "Almost every section of the work," says Hoffmann, "is a rich treasure-house for the pastor." The science had been merely sketched out by Schleiermacher. Nitzsch raised it almost to perfection. Large parts of the work he derived directly from his own personal experience in Church work.

With the completing of this work, in the summer of 1867, the earthly task of Nitzsch seemed to be about accomplished. The previous year he had returned unrestored from his usual vacation-excursion in the Harz. Conscious that his end was near, he now laid down the most of his offices. Partial paraly-

sis lamed him, and rendered speaking difficult. Though momentarily recovering from this, his mind found not again its full, proper relation to the outer world. His spirit led now predominantly a sort of dream-life, busied with the sublime themes natural to his condition. Occasionally he seemed to come back more fully to the world of reality. For a short period he was possessed with an irresistible desire to preach, and he delivered, in fact, several beautiful addresses. On the arrival of his golden wedding, June 24, 1868, he enjoyed a day of the happiest sunshine. To a bevy of fair maidens who bore him festive greetings he addressed beautiful words on the happiness and dangers of youth. Shortly thereafter he determined to resign his last office, the pastorate. In a truly touching and Christian manner he discoursed to his friends of his near end, and of the bitterness of death, and of his victory over it through Christ. The final hour, however, came only by slow approaches. The matured spirit seemed reluctant to quit the yet vigorous body. And when it did finally come—August 21, 1868, when he had reached the age of eighty years and eleven months—it seemed little other than that the venerable man had folded his hands and gently fallen to sleep.

Such was Carl Immanuel Nitzsch. What was the ground-character of his nature? what was it that gave to him such power over men, and commanded in so high degree their respect? We need hardly state it. It was the thorough and matured harmony of his personality. His life did not consist, as is so often the case with great men, of two distinct and hardly reconcilable halves, but was a beautifully rounded whole. It is not presumption to say that he united in himself, to a very unusual degree, all the excellent qualities that lie, isolatedly and exaggerated, in the manifold extremes of character which noted men usually present. He was extreme in nothing. He was neither a mere speculatist nor a mere practitioner, neither a reactionist nor a radical, neither a hand-bound orthodoxist nor an anchorless rationalist, neither an intellectualist nor a sentimentalist, neither all head nor all heart; but he was the harmonized good of all these, and that, too, to such a degree that we cannot say that any one of these phases of character was so prominent in him as to dwarf the others. For the ground of this rounded harmony of character

he was indebted to both nature and to grace. The family which bore him was of a noble stock, consisting largely of clerics and savants. His two brothers were men of note. His four sisters were consorts of clergymen, (one of them the efficient helper of Rudolf Stier.) And his sons after him have risen to high posts. His own youth was extraordinarily gifted. In the harmony and beauty of his physique he was highly favored, and in the affectionately-domestic, pious, and cultured atmosphere that surrounded his childhood and youth, more highly still. Under the warming influence of such a churchly and erudite sunshine, what wonder that grace took early and deep root, and that the evangelical spirit soon became so immanent in him as almost entirely to metamorphose his natural nature and to render his Christian life an easy, harmonious, and deepening and widening flow, proof against common outer temptations, and almost free from inner conflict! "God has given me few passions," said he once upon an occasion of general excitement. It was not, however, mere nature, but the chastening discipline of the Spirit that enabled him to stand rock-firm, but at the same time peace-counseling and peace-bringing, amid the wildest surgings of popular commotion. "His rich erudition," says Beyschlag, "and his eagle-sweep of mind, awoke, indeed, general astonishment; but that which made his students and friends look up to him with reverence was the ethico-religious consecration that was poured out over this greatness, the consciously-felt unity in him of doctrine and life."

Nitzsch's works are available only for Germans. They are worse even than Rothe's in their Heraclitic untranslatableness. Some of them have, indeed, been printed in English; but as a German scholar once remarked to the writer, their contents have not been molded, but only "over-set," into English. It is only by the process of free reproduction that Nitzsch can and does affect the Anglo-Saxon Church-life. In Germany, however, he will for a long while to come stand high as a vigorous Christian thinker, and even higher still as a model of a beautifully rich Christian life.

Dr. Beyschlag applies to him the petition which Nitzsch himself once wrote in an album: *Domine, da nobis* ALTERUM *Lutherum.* May not English Christians also join in the prayer?

Art. IV.—NATURE OF A CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT.

The relative importance which any Church attaches to the Sacraments determines its own position in reference to the fundamental truths of religion. As the outward and visible rites through which the Church externalizes its inner life, in the reasons for, and modes of, using them, not only do the tenets which separate the Christian worlds into distinct organizations come to light, but "the opinions we form of them are sure to mingle, insensibly perhaps to ourselves, with our views of every part of practical religion." *

And this of necessity; for the sentiments we entertain of the Sacraments depend upon, and are determined by, our Theory of the Church.† "High" views of the Church and of the Sacraments are ever found in close correspondence with each other, and the same is true of "Low" views; for both the one and the other flow necessarily and immediately out of the conceptions we form of the Triune Godhead, whose nature and relations to us it is the office of the Church to unfold, and of whose working in time the history of the Church is the record.

Mr. Watson, in his Theological Institutes,‡ maintains the essential peculiarity of the Sacraments to be that they are "federal acts," and says that there are three leading views of their nature, namely, the Popish, the Socinian, and that of the Churches of the Reformation. How far this is a proper definition of their characters will be matter of inquiry; but assuming it, it may be seriously questioned whether the division based on it is correct. For, setting aside the propriety of putting the Socinians as representatives of those who hold to the commemorative character of them, on the ground of their being federal acts, that is, covenant rites in which two parties give and take, man assuming the obligations, and God conveying the blessings, of the Covenant, there does not appear dis-

* Keble, "Preface to Hooker's Works," p. xliii.

† Nevin, "The Mystical Presence." Preface: "The entire question of the Church centers ultimately in the sacramental question as its heart and core."

‡ Vol. ii, pp. 607, 608.

crepancy between this and the Romish view of them sufficient to constitute a generic difference.

It is more correct, however, both in fact and logic, to say that there are, and can be, of the nature of a Sacrament, but two leading theories. For when we pass beyond the mere verbiage of the formula in which the whole Christian world agrees, that Sacraments are outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace, radical and irreconcilable division begins at once upon the attempt to determine whether the signs precede the grace, or grace the signs. Differences there are as to the things comprehended under the terms "signs" and "grace," and these constitute denominational peculiarities; but two great systems of thought, embracing in their wide sweep the entire circle of Christian life and discipline, and standing in broad and complete contrast to each other, result from the holding by one or the other of these alternative views. And observation of the state of the Christian world confirms this; for all distinctions between separate denominations are small compared with those which divide the Church of Christ into two distinct groups, two hostile camps, so to speak—the sacerdotal or hierarchical, and the evangelical; and the bond of alliance between the members of each group respectively is the opinion entertained of the nature of the Sacraments.

The two theories may be drawn out as follows: One is that Sacraments are instruments, and vehicles, which convey or confer peculiar and special grace. The other is that they are signs and tokens, to commemorate something previously existing.

In the one theory, they are means efficacious to a designed and specific end, that end being a spiritual condition, which must of necessity be subsequent to, and consequent upon, the use of them. In the other, they are simply declaratory of an existing fact which is testified to by them, and which, consequently, precedes them.*

The former of these theories is advocated, with variations

* *Avia media* was sought by Calvin and some of the Anglican reformers between these opposing theories, and has been attempted by many since. When its mystical and obscure terms are clearly defined it will be found to resolve itself into one or the other of the above. On the question of the Sacraments, Calvin was a High Churchman. See Dorner, "History Protestant Theology," vol. i, p. 405.

upon subordinate points, by the Church of Rome, the Lutheran Church, and the Church of England, and constitutes the Sacramentarian or High-Church System. The latter is, with like modifications, the creed of Evangelical Christendom. The Greek Church coincides with the former, but need not now be more particularly noticed.

We purpose stating the Sacramentarian theory in the language of its advocates, and then examining and confuting the fundamental principle on which it rests, before presenting and establishing our own.

I. The CHURCH OF ROME holds, as is well known, the most extreme views upon this question. Without equivocation, she distinctly declares the Sacraments to be the exclusive channels of divine grace, the only means by which spiritual life is begun, sustained, and completed, only to be administered by a lawful priest, and only to be approached through an awful and imposing ritual. Thus, the Council of Florence, held in 1442, decreed as follows:* "The Sacraments of the new law contain grace, and confer it on those who worthily receive them."

The Council of Trent (1547) decreed in its Canons:

Canon 4. Whoever shall affirm that the Sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, or that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these Sacraments: let him be accursed.

Canon 6. Whoever shall affirm that the Sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way: let him be accursed.

Canon 7. Whoever shall affirm that grace is not always given by these Sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received: let him be accursed.

Canon 8. Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by the Sacraments of the new law, by their own power, (*ex opere operato:*) let him be accursed.

The catechism of the Council of Trent defines a Sacrament as follows: "A Sacrament is a thing subject to the senses, and possessing, by divine institution, at once the power of signifying sanctity and justice, and of imparting both to the receiver."†

* Elliott on Romanism, vol. i, pp. 172, 173, 175.

† See Moehler, "Symbolism," vol. i, p. 286. Second edition, London. "Man, as a being belonging to the world of sense, stands in need of a sensible type to obtain and preserve the consciousness of what passes in his supersensual part."

The sentiments of the LUTHERAN CHURCH are expressed by Knapp, "Christian Theology," p. 481:

By the word Sacraments is understood, in the Lutheran Church, those religious rites and ceremonies which God himself has instituted in the Holy Scriptures, by which certain spiritual blessings are represented and actually communicated. Their essential characteristics are: (*a*) external religious acts, (*b*) positively instituted (*c*) by God himself, (*d*) not only exhibit or represent to the senses spiritual blessings; but actually communicate them.*

And in like manner Bishop Martensen: †

The sacred tokens of the new covenant contain also an actual communication of the being and life of the risen Christ. . . . In the Sacraments the deepest mystery rests in the truth that in them Christ communicates himself not only spiritually but in his glorified corporeity. . . . The new covenant must once for all be established in man, and must from time to time be renewed, [that is, by the Sacraments.] We cannot maintain the full reality and distinctiveness of the Sacraments, unless, with Luther, we recognize therein not only a spiritual mystery, but a mystery of nature likewise. ‡

The CHURCH OF ENGLAND (and what is true of her is also of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this land) holds together in her communion two distinct parties, one of which symbolizes as to the nature of the Sacraments with the Reformed Churches, while the others, which shows stronger affiliations with Rome and maintains the High Sacramentarian theory, is more properly representative of the Church. For though differing greatly from Rome as to the importance to be attached to the material elements of the Sacraments, (*opus operatum*,) she no less strenuously asserts their efficaciousness.

The Romanists pretend that to Sacraments we ascribe no efficacy, but make them bare signs of instruction or admonition; which is utterly false. For Sacraments with us are signs effectual; they are instruments of God, whereby to bestow grace;

* Cf. Dorner, "History Protestant Theology," vol. i, p. 306 *et seq.;* Shedd, "History Christian Doctrines," ii, 451; McClintock and Strong, Art. "Augsburgh Confession," ii, 5, 10; Browne, "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 602.

† "Christian Dogmatics," pp. 418, 419, 421.

‡ As to the Reformed Church in distinction from the Lutheran, and especially the teaching of Calvin, see Nevin, "Mystical Presence," p. 61, 62: "Two points in the theory of the Reformed Church require to be held in view: one is that the grace goes inseparably along with the sign, the other is that the invisible grace of the Sacraments is the substantial life of the Saviour, particularly in his human nature."

howbeit grace not proceeding from the visible sign, but from his invisible power." *

The opinions of the Church of England are by no one more fairly and truly set forth than by Bishop Browne, from whom we quote: †

In the Twenty-fifth Article Sacraments are defined to be "effectual signs of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly in us." In the Homily [on Common Prayer and Sacraments,] visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ." In like manner Nowell's Catechism, a semi-authoritative document, has the following: "By Baptism we are born again; by the Holy Supper we are nourished to everlasting life." Jewel's Apology, a similar authority, says: "We assert that Christ truly exhibits himself present with us in his Sacraments, and this in deed and in truth."

So also Hooker, perhaps the greatest divine in her communion: ‡

It is therefore required to the nature of a Sacrament, Fourthly, that it have a promise from God for the effect of some saving grace to be thereby wrought in the person of the receiver.

Again:

The Sacraments are accompanied with grace that worketh Salvation.

This is therefore the necessity of Sacraments: That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of his whole Church, by Sacraments he severally deriveth into every member thereof. For we take not baptism nor the eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but for means effectual whereby God when we take the Sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify. §

It were needless to multiply quotations; these will suffice to show that however great may be the differences between the Communions specified as to life and morals, (and they are great,) there is agreement between them as to the essential character of a Sacrament.

* Hooker, "Ecclesiastical Polity," book v, app. No. 1.

† "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 604.

‡ "Ecclesiastical Polity," book v, app. No. 1; book v, chap. l, [3]; book v, chap. lvii, [5].

§ See work called "Vox Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ," in which the sentiments of many English Divines are quoted at length. Chaps. iv, v.

II. Alliances are possible only through the medium of some common term admitted by the parties thereto, and an agreement so far between the members of the group of sacerdotal and (*par excellence*) ritualistic Churches, implies, of necessity, some common principle underlying their creeds, the nexus or bond of union between them. This connecting link is to be found, we believe, in the common idea entertained by them of the nature of the Church, especially in its relation to the Incarnation of our Lord.

While in the Reformed Churches generally that Incarnation is regarded, and without any derogation from its transcendent dignity and value, as a means to an end, a participation of flesh and blood which had for its purpose our redemption from guilt and sin, and was a necessary preliminary to that death by which divine justice was satisfied, and the ransom-price paid for our souls, and while therefore in their belief, when the end for which that earthly life was lived was accomplished, it was needful that He should go away that the Comforter might come; in the High Church theory the Incarnation is made a perpetually continuing and still existing earthly fact. Christ in his humanity, like a disembodied spirit, still hovers about the earth he once walked; his manifestation in the flesh being prolonged as it were in the form of the Church, which is assumed to be, in a peculiar sense, the perpetual embodiment of him. Instead of, or perhaps besides, the inward spiritual processes of divine grace, an outward and visible medium is required for union with him, that is, with his manhood, and this medium is the Sacraments, by which the veritable Christ is imparted to us. By them, as in the Sacrament of the Supper for instance, either by the conversion of the elements, (transubstantiation,) or by union with them, (consubstantiation,) or in a form impalpable to the senses but yet real, (spiritual presence so called,) must the humanity of our Lord be implanted in us, and it is as being the Body, the living Incarnation of Christ, that the Church dispenses them.*

Numberless proofs might be offered to substantiate the cor-

* See Liddon on the "Divinity of Christ," p. 479 *et seq.* 490. Moberly, "Administration of the Holy Spirit," sec. vi, pp. 183–185. Also Wilberforce on the "Incarnation," especially chap. xi. "Christ is present with men in his Church or body mystical."

rectness of this assertion. It will be sufficient to adduce in testimony of it references from a few typical and standard authorities. Thus Hooker (Anglican): *

It is on all sides confessed, first, that this Sacrament (the Lord's Supper) is a true and real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth himself, even his whole entire person, as a mystical head unto every soul that receiveth him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a mystical member of him; secondly, that to whom the person of Christ is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same sacrament his Holy Spirit, to sanctify them as it sanctified him which is their head; thirdly, that what merit, force, or virtue soever there is in his sacrificed body and blood, we freely, fully, and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly, that the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life.

Again, Martensen, (Lutheran): †

This organic and abiding connection between the Church and her unseen Head is the fundamental mystery upon which the Church reposes. Upon this foundation the mystery of the Sacraments rests. In the Sacraments, which are the expression of the most sacred presence of the ascended Lord, in His Church, he makes the kingdom of nature and of sense the instrument of those secret workings by which he makes believers partakers of the reality, not only of his spiritual, but of his glorified corporeal nature.

And again Moehler, (Roman Catholic): ‡

The Church, considered in one point of view, is the living figure of Christ manifesting himself and working through all ages, whose atoning and redeeming acts it in consequence eternally repeats and uninterruptedly continues. The Redeemer is eternally living in his Church, and, in the Sacrament of the altar, he hath manifested this in a sensible manner to creatures endowed with sense. He is, in the announcement of his word, the abiding teacher; in baptism he perpetually receives the children of men into his communion; in the tribunal of penance he pardons the contrite sinner; strengthens rising youth with the power of his Spirit in confirmation; breathes into the bridegroom and the bride a higher conception of the nuptial relations, unites himself most intimately with all who sigh for eternal life under the forms of bread and wine; and in holy orders institutes the organs by which he worketh all this with never-tiring activity. If Christ, concealed under an earthly vail, unfolds to the end of time his whole course of ac-

* "Ecclesiastical Polity," book v, chap. lxvii, 7. See also book v, chaps. lvii, lviii.

† "Christian Dogmatics," pp. 325–328. See also p. 436.

‡ Moehler, "Symbolism," vol. i, p. 335. Second edition, London.

tions begun on earth, he, of necessity, eternally "offers himself to the Father as a victim for men," and the real permanent exposition hereof can never fail in the Church, if the historical Christ is to celebrate in her his entire imperishable existence.

This is the ground upon which Rome asserts the Sacraments to be seven in number. For if such be the relation of the Church to Christ—as his prolonged and perpetuated Incarnation—then those acts by which, at these critical epochs of human life, she conveys her power, are the acts of the Christ himself embodied in her, and hence are Sacraments. The only plea by which the force of this conclusion upon these premises can be escaped, must be, that there is no basis in reason for their number, but that they rest upon the express enactment of the Saviour. And if such is their nature, if body and matter can be so glorified as to become vehicles for the communication of such transcendent mysteries, what can be more proper than a grand and imposing ritual, splendid enough to represent to the senses the awfulness of the solemn transactions then occurring, and yet shadowy and obscure enough to conceal from the unsatisfied soul their hollowness?

III. Many difficulties in the way of receiving this theory occur at once to the minds of those conversant with the word of God, but there are two especially that seem to be fatal to it.

One is, that it mistakes the nature and purpose of the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, and derogates from the dignity of that wonderful fact. The same powerful objections that lie against Calvinism may be lodged against it. It limits the Atonement—the limiting condition, in one case, being Imputation, in the other, the Sacraments.

Plainly, according to the Scriptures, the purpose of the Incarnation was Atonement. The office which the Son of God executes in the plan of redemption is the removing the hinderances which the Law places to our salvation, and the satisfying with his own blood Divine Justice; and in effecting our redemption he became flesh for all flesh. He could not die for one man without dying for all men, for it was in that human nature which was common to him with all men that he died. His humanity touched all humanity, not provisionally nor conditionally, but actually; and by his death all humanity

was redeemed. If the virtue of that redemption be lost by actual and personal guilt, it must be restored by the same means; and in the one case and the other it is not the Sacraments which give us the right to redemption, but because of redemption we have the right to the Sacraments.

The other objection is, that this theory trenches upon the Divinity and coequal dignity of God the Holy Ghost. This is the assailable point of ritualism, the flank, which turned, its whole line may be crushed and broken. As ritualism has added the "filioque" to the creed, so has it taken the spirit out of the life of the Church. If it does not in words deny his divinity, see how, at any rate, it tethers and cramps him; with what pain it controls and curbs his operations, lest he may have some liberty of independent action; how carefully it wraps him around with the fetters of a visible Church, within which only he may work; how it attenuates him to a thin shade, a spectral and inferior attendant and agent in the plan of salvation; how any possible part in the origination of Christian life is denied him.

Could any thing be more inconsistent with the whole tenor of the Scriptures? "It is expedient for you that I go away. If I go I will send another Comforter." Not that we mean to fall into the error of representing the Holy Ghost as in any sense the successor of Christ, or denying the presence in some sense of the Saviour in the Church. No, but that as the office of the Son of God is atonement, propitiation, so in the plan of redemption all that has reference to renewal, regeneration, the imparting of life, is the work of the Holy Spirit. Harmoniously, co-operatively, these Divine Persons move in the effecting of salvation. What the Church of Christ most needs now is clearer statements of the nature and office of the Holy Spirit, and the influence which this should have in the organization of the Church, the valid and divinely attested churchmanship of all in whom the Spirit has done his work, and on whom he has set his seal. This we take to be the peculiar characteristic of Methodism, and constitutes its claim to existence. It is the failure to appreciate this which has contented many standard works of divinity with so brief a notice of the Holy Ghost; so that, judging from the limited space which is allotted to him in creeds, and decrees of councils, and theological institutes, it

might be seriously questioned if we ever heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.*

IV. The one theory of the nature of the Sacraments has been examined. Sustained by great ecclesiastical organizations, supported by an array of names mighty in the annals of the Church, it does not coincide with the Holy Scriptures, it does not satisfy the wants of the heart. If it be not correct, there remains only the other theory. If the Sacraments are not means and channels of grace, no rational explanation can be given of them than as signs and testimonials of it.

This theory is by no means new. Something might be adduced to show that it is not inconsistent with the statements of the early Fathers of the Church, if these be taken with considerable latitude. It, however, received a fuller development at the time of the Reformation, and has since continued as the faith of a large section of the Church. That it has not met wider reception, and been more generally acknowledged, is due, among other things, to this, that while it correctly presents the commemorative character of the Sacraments, it has not clearly set forth, nor with any unanimity insisted upon, that of which they are commemorative. The strength of the sacramentarian theory lies in this: It demands for the Sacraments an importance which the word of God justifies; it presents a weighty reason for their administration, in that they execute an office which can be fulfilled by nothing else, and a reason which, mistaken though it is, secures for them a reverence faulty only by excess; it rightly grasps the truth that they have an objective as well as a subjective value, an importance in themselves as well as in the heart of the receiver. With the Commemorationists, however, they have been too often lowered to the level of mere badges or tokens of profession, (as was the case with Zwingli, if, indeed, that great man has not been misunderstood,) or else have been made to depend for their value so exclusively upon the faith and inward feeling of the participant, that the ques-

* It needs but to consult any books written by the Sacramentarians to see how little space is accorded the Holy Spirit. See Archbishop Manning (Roman Catholic) on "The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost," especially the chapter on "The Relation of the Holy Ghost to the Church." Whoever would do for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit what Dörner has done for that of "The Person of Christ" would confer an inestimable benefit on the cause of truth. It would modify our opinions of many a so-called heretic—Montanus, for instance.

tion has been at once started in the mind of the objector, whether the same inner state would not be just as acceptable to God, and profitable to man, without as with the Sacraments.*

Besides showing a worthy office for them, any definition of the Sacraments, to be correct, must show their consistency with the essential characteristics of revealed religion, for they would be burdens to, and not helpers of, our faith if they were out of keeping with that system of truth of which they profess to be outward symbols. Now among these leading features of the Christian religion, with the requirements of which any definition must comply, are these: It is founded on historic truth; it has a ground-work of facts and events in human history which cannot be assailed without impeaching its own integrity;† it is marked by a sublime simplicity, being the revelation of a God who is light, and in whom is no darkness at all; it is a rational system, fearlessly addressing itself to the reason of man as coinciding with its necessary intuitions; its end is man's spirituality.

And though it be not so necessary, it would certainly add great force to any definition to be able to comprehend within its scope the Jewish as well as the Christian sacraments. For inasmuch as the principles of administration of an unchangeable God are unchangeable, varied only in application to meet various exigencies, it is probable that the two Churches are but continuous parts of one great scheme, and that whatever is of the essence of baptism and the eucharist is equally so of circumcision and the passover, which are distinguished by broad lines from the rest of the Mosaic economy.

The system of things under which we are living, and of which the Jewish and the Christian Church are parts, is preeminently a plan of redemption. With the perception of this only can the mysteries of nature and of revelation be inter-

* Principal Cunningham, "Historical Theology," vol. ii, p. 125: "The general doctrine of Protestants upon this subject, though there is some diversity in their mode of explaining it, is this, that the Sacraments are symbolical or exhibitive ordinances. . . . *They regard them, however, as mere appendages to the word or the truth, and as exerting no influence whatever, apart from the faith which the participation in them expresses.*" To this last part we object.

† See a choice work, "Belief, What Is It?" p. 10, *et seq.* Blackwood & Sons. 1869.

preted. When by the fall sin entered into the world and the orderly government of God was disturbed, that plan was inaugurated. The covenant of works was superseded by the covenant of grace. To restore this interrupted harmony, the direct government of the Father gave place to a mediatorial and provisional system, the execution of which was committed to God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, each of whom has his personal and peculiar share in the accomplishment of the end. All that relates to atonement or propitiation is the office of the Son, as essential to which, a body was prepared him to do the will of God. All that has reference to renewal, imparting of life, is the office of the Holy Ghost, "the Lord and giver of life." The atonement must precede renewal; renewal or regeneration must complete atonement. The ideas are distinct, but in unison; both divine Persons work harmoniously together, and will until the prayer is answered fully, "Our Father, thy kingdom come," and "the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father." Of this plan of redemption the Sacraments are copies writ to the eye. We define them thus:

The Sacraments are outward and visible signs, testifying, *primarily*, to the divinity of God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, the agents in the great work of redemption, with the appropriate office of each in that work; taking their rise from, and thereby historically attesting, events of world-wide importance, in which the peculiar office of each of these divine Persons was specifically manifested; *secondarily*, testifying, on the part of the recipient, his personal participation of the office of that divine Person whose sacrament he commemorates. Baptism is the sacrament of the Holy Ghost; the Supper, the sacrament of the Son of God.

The arguments upon which the correctness of this definition is based are two: it rationally accounts for and explains all the characteristical features of the Sacraments, and it conforms to the general tenor of the Holy Scriptures.

1. As to the first of these arguments, if the Sacraments are testimonies to the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit:

(*a.*) An office of the utmost importance is assigned them; they have a value in themselves which fully deserves and justifies our reverence. In them the spirit of man testifies that its wants are met by them of whom the water and the blood

are signs, and the three that thus bear record on earth agree in one.

(*b.*) A rational ground is laid for limiting the number of them to two; they must be these, they can be no more.

(*c.*) A broad line distinguishes them from mere ceremonies, such as feet-washing for instance, which, while allegorically expressing a truth, stands in connection with no such peculiar office of the Son, or the Spirit, and with no historical event of world-wide importance.

(*d.*) Historically, baptism dates from the day of Pentecost, upon which the Holy Spirit descended to create the Christian Church; or, if any man wishes to go further back, from the descent of the Spirit, in the "form of a dove," upon Jesus, when the life that had dwelt in the bosom of the Father began visibly to be manifested to the world: the Lord's Supper was inaugurated upon

> That sad, memorable night
> When Jesus was for us betrayed.

And while we may not look for the same clearness of truth in the Jewish sacraments, circumcision was instituted when Abraham was called to found a new nation and Church, and another name, typical of a new nature, was given him—things plainly foreshadowing the work of the Spirit; and the Passover stands in unquestioned connection with a deliverance from bondage in which the virtue of atoning blood was typified.

As signs, secondarily, of our personal appropriation of redemption, this definition serves to designate:

(*a.*) The persons to whom the Sacraments may be administered. They are legitimately used so far, and only so far, as they express the truth. To pardoned and converted adults both are lawful; to infants the communion, which designates deliverance from personal guilt, is not proper, while the sign of the new birth is appropriate to them, as having had that "manifestation of the Spirit" which has counteracted depravity so far as to make them eligible to the kingdom of heaven.

(*b.*) It determines the mode of administration. That mode of applying baptism which is likest the pouring out of the Spirit from on high, and of receiving the communion which most resembles the putting forth of faith to appropriate the

merits of the Redeemer, is the fittest to express the nature and office of both.

2. The scriptural argument can be only hinted at here. To elaborate it would require a volume. The general tenor of the word agrees, as investigation will show, with these, which we present as texts representative of the mind of the Scriptures: Of *Baptism*, "Born again of water and of the Spirit;"* "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"† Of *the Lord's Supper*, "Do this in remembrance of me;"‡ "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come."§ The connection of the Spirit with baptism is as well marked, and as constantly enforced, as is that of the Lord's death with the Lord's table.

Art. V.—CHAMBERLAYNE ON SAVING FAITH.

Saving Faith: its Rationale: with a Demonstration of its Presence in the Organic Condition of Methodist Church Membership. A Treatise in Two Parts. By Rev. Israel Chamberlayne, D.D. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

Manifestly, this book was not intended for mere cursory readers, nor for superficial thinkers. Let all such do themselves and the author the kindness of letting it alone. It is not other than an earnest, manly, masterly discussion of a very grave subject, for momentous and manifest reasons. Its purpose is nothing less, nor else, than to show that there prevails extensively, perhaps generally, both in the Methodist Church, and throughout other Churches, a very grave and most injurious misapprehension of the organic law and common usage of our Church, relative to the conditions of Church membership. Indeed, the author of this treatise alleges that we have widely departed from primitive Methodistic teaching concerning *Saving Faith*, as well as with reference to the prerequisites for Church-membership. If this be true, is it not remarkable?

In the General Rules, which are *de facto* the Constitution of the Church and the platform of ecclesiastical Methodism, we learn that "*There is only one condition previously required*

* John iii, 5. † Acts x, 47. ‡ Luke xxii, 19. § 1 Cor. xi, 26.

of those who desire admission into these societies—a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." Now, it is understood by many—by most, perhaps—that this *only one condition* does not express, or necessarily imply, saving faith; and that, consequently, persons may, and that multitudes do, by constitutional provision, become members of the Church, without being truly converted; or, in other words, without saving faith. Our author affirms and demonstrates the fact of the misapprehension, and of the practical error now generally prevalent throughout the Church, and the consequent wide departure from primitive Wesleyanism. And, what is very surprising, in connection with this departure from original Methodism, concerning the import of the *only one condition*, and this misapprehension of the nature and effects of saving faith, there is, of consequence, involved a misjudgment of the actual religious condition of those who are recognized as complying with this single and singular condition of membership!

In all sections of the country, however, these grave misapprehensions are not equally prevalent and apparent. In some portions, without the full recognition of saving faith in the only one condition, they do, nevertheless, as though by a gracious instinct, require saving faith, or real experimental religion, as a prerequisite to membership.

That any portion of the Church should judge and practice otherwise cannot be deemed otherwise than surprising when we contemplate the requisites to admission into the Church from the true Wesleyan stand-point. And were it not for undeniable facts, as well as for the extorted and the voluntary admissions of our own people, we might be disposed to deny our author's startling allegations, and charge him with a needless combat with a man of straw.

No Church, perhaps, has supposed itself more distinctly evangelical, especially in relation to religious experience; and none has claimed for itself greater unanimity in all essential doctrines, than ours. In these things we have bordered, if we have not encroached, upon arrogancy, and laid ourselves open to the accusation of boasting. And has it indeed come to pass that we now generally misapprehend the very nature and effects of saving faith, and thereby misunderstand the scriptural condition of membership in the Church of Christ? If so,

the phenomenon must be regarded as one of the most remarkable of ecclesiastical mutations.

And yet even such a surprising departure from primitiveness may be accounted for without much difficulty. For a generation past we have observed, not without painful apprehensions, a growing tendency to displace, or, at least, to supplement, our original doctrinal and disciplinary standards, by others of more modern date and adaptation, because the latter have been considered better suited to the marvelous improvements of the age.

Our curriculum of ministerial study comprises a much wider range of subjects than formerly, and greater proficiency in general history, general literature and science. It has been supposed—perhaps, not unwisely—that our candidates for admission and for orders must keep abreast of the schools in variety and extent of scholarship. In our conference examinations we are too apt to be satisfied with superficial knowledge of many books, and seem to value it more highly than the thorough mastery of a few studies more essential to the peculiarities of Methodism.

If more knowledge of Wesley, Watson, Benson, Clarke, and Fletcher, and more of the Discipline were required, and less of less essential things, we should be in less peril of swerving from our primitive standards of doctrinal and experimental divinity. We are in perpetual danger of eliminating essential elements from our creed as obsolete, or at least dispensable, and of substituting, virtually if not in reality, something new, by way of improvement. The notion is popular that the wonderful progress of things in these favored times must affect every thing, even doctrines and experiences; and new views and novel methods are treated with much less carefulness and severity than formerly. The facts are patent to all. The tendencies and results are not less apparent. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Unceasing watchfulness is the cost of theological purity.

This remarkable treatise on saving faith is rigidly systematic, thorough, and exhaustive. It is arranged in two parts, and subdivided into numerous and usually very short sections. The internal arrangement of the work is quite unlike anything of the kind that we have before noticed; but it is quite con-

venient for reading, for reference, and quotation. It is characteristic, however, and adds not a little to the interest and effectiveness of the argument. Our venerable author's remarkable idiosyncracy is unmistakably impressed upon every page of his book, and its peculiar physiognomy is revealed in almost every sentence that he has composed. Nor would we wish it otherwise. The treatise derives much of its value from its striking uniqueness and strong individuality.

The opening sentence sufficiently indicates the *occasion* of the writing, and the *object* to be accomplished.

> The object of this little treatise has its apology in the occasion of it. The occasion. Long and freely has it been charged by our sister Churches, and, we regret to say, as long and freely conceded by ourselves, that, as a professed Church of Christ, we do, under organic sanction—the sanction of the General Rules—require no saving faith in order to membership among us; no true conversion; no real Christianity whatever. Nay, historically as well as logically, this concession, by antedating the accusation, is at once the historic and logical cause of it.
>
> The object now attempted is, by proving the concession gratuitous, to leave the imputation to the fate of all baseless things. Or, more explicitly, it is the present purpose to prove that the terms in which the General Rules state the one only condition of membership, collated with the teachings and facts of sacred writ, and with the concurrent judgment of orthodox divines generally, including that of Messrs. Wesley and Fletcher in particular, do fairly and beyond question imply a faith which is properly saving, that brings eternal salvation to all who keep it to the end.

A right manly task is this, and right manfully does he gird himself for the effort. Does the labor seem gigantic? He is not a child—a pigmy—a faint heart who undertakes it. It is a battle in earnest, and it will not be decided with small arms, or by puny efforts; heavy ordnance, most skillfully handled, must win or lose the triumph.

When an important engagement is about to take place between well-matched forces, it is of thrilling interest to watch the preliminary maneuverings of the opposing armies, and discover, if we can, the plan of the battle; and we always watch with peculiar interest the principal points of attack and defense. He is by no means an unskillful general who is now marshaling and maneuvering his forces for the attack. He is a veteran in dialectics, and he fully comprehends the position

and strength of the enemy. Will he hurl all his legions at once, and open all his batteries at the outset, and endeavor to crush his enemy at a single blow? Or will he be as wary as brave, and keep his forces well in hand and hold, in reserve his heaviest ordnance and his most reliable forces, to insure not only the defeat of the foe, but his utter annihilation? We shall see.

The first attack is made upon the opposite position in respect to the *nature of saving faith*. Is it, or is it not, implied in a "desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins?" which is the only one condition of membership. He proposes to give "a scriptural and rational definition of this matter of faith as the condition of the sinner's pardon, at least a little less complicated and inexact than any which has fallen under our [his] limited notice."

He begins with an illustration of the sinner's pardon. A State is imperiled by an insurrection. The government decides on measures of clemency toward the guilty, and issues a manifesto to that effect. This is termed an *amnesty*, which pledges not merely forgiveness of the crime, but the complete restoration of those who cease their rebellion and comply with the terms of the amnesty. The case supposed provides a *condition*, which is, *submission* to just authority, and suitable assurances of loyalty and quietness in the future.

The inherent defectiveness of all human affairs prevents the application of the illustration to the inward moral change that is provided for in the Gospel, which is the amnesty of God. But, so far as it relates to the voluntary submission of the sinner, the reality of his pardon, the removal of the condemnation, and the restoration of the penitent transgressor to the favor of the offended sovereign, the illustration is satisfactory.

The effort now is to demonstrate that the "desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins," implies such a moral change as can be secured only in connection with saving faith: the faith that insures the favor of God, and changes the relation of the person by whom it is exercised, so that he is no longer obnoxious to the curse of the law. He now fears God and works righteousness, and is therefore accepted of God.

The more distinct application of the illustration to the case in hand, giving our author's own language, is this:

> The amnesty of God—the *evangelism* of the New Testament—is a proclamation of pardon to sinners by the moral Governor of the universe. The benefit of this act is conditioned on faith in Christ. Faith is credence of testimony. Divine faith is credence or belief of divine testimony. It is *objective* and *subjective*. Its object being divine testimony, as just noted, is contained in the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments, and is divine, both as being itself of God and as having respect to the Christ, who is "God manifest in the flesh." Moreover, the faith in question is divine, as well from its *subjective* as its *objective* character. . . . The faith necessary to salvation, then—all the *objective* faith necessary to that end—is simply believing what the Bible teaches, especially as to Christ and the way of salvation by him.

There is much more to the same effect. Our author now proceeds to the full and almost redundant exhibition of *subjective* faith and its relation to the faith that is *objective*. We cannot do better than to allow him to speak for himself:

> Objectively, then, faith as heretofore implied is a thing of the understanding, having exclusive respect to testimony as its object, and terminating in its—the understanding's—simple assent to the truth of that testimony. The subjectivity of faith marks the effect of that same testimony on the sensibilities and will of the subject, and terminates in consent, as distinguished from assent; that is, in feeling and willing what the testimony demands. As assent to the testimony is independent of sensibility and volition, it is the sheer act of the faculty that perceives, understands, and judges. On the other hand, consent, in strictness, can only take place by yielding that which we have power to withhold. It is, therefore, the act of the will. In a word, objective faith perceives and assents; subjectively, faith feels and consents, or determines.

Treating the subject quite diffusely, our author shows that such faith fulfills the terms of God's amnesty, and that such faith must be implied in the *one condition* of Church membership, as expressed in the General Rules. And he now anticipates a "possible objection: "The faith above defined, being incognizant of assurance, belongs to the merely penitent; whereas, saving faith embraces the evidence of pardon, enabling to believe and say, 'My sins are all forgiven.'"

This objection is very clearly answered, by showing that "the *condition* of pardon cannot include the *assurance* of it; because the condition of pardon is, from its very nature, some-

thing done in order to it, and, therefore, *before* it. But assurance of the fact of pardon can only *follow* that fact. That it goes before, or enters into, the *condition* of that fact, is, therefore, false, and a contradiction."

Here he anticipates another objection, founded on the assumption that, though subsequent in the order of relation, yet the assurance of pardon is so immediately associated with the pardon itself as to be practically inseparable, and, therefore, the distinction of before and after is of little or no practical utility. To this objection, thus briefly stated, he replies: "That its whole force depends upon its fallacy. Its fallacy lies in the assumption, that whenever God pardons, he does immediately, and in all cases, follow that fact by his Spirit's witness of it." But this he denies, as an assumption not in agreement with the nature of the case, not sustained by the testimony of the word of God, not in accordance with common Christian consciousness. Then, by appealing to Scripture examples, as in the case of Cornelius, he shows "That God does *not*, in all cases, conjoin his pardon of sinners with his Spirit's immediate notice of it to the subject." It is shown in various ways; for example, that Cornelius, who feared God and wrought righteousness, and was, therefore, accepted of God, could not have been at the same time an unbelieving, unpardoned sinner, although he had not the faith of assurance.

Keeping the objection still in view, and maintaining that it is only an assumption without proof, that pardon and the assurance of it are practically inseparable, our author devotes a section to St. Paul's illustration of the progressive nature of Christianity, in respect of the attainment of the privileges of full maturity, or full age, as in the case of a *son under age*, who is treated as if he were a *servant* only. He thus classes a good many of the familiar characters of the Scripture narrative. After mature consideration, the following deductions are made, as matters of moral demonstration: "1. That the assumed fact of Divine acceptance, as immediately conjoined with the Spirit's explicit witness in all cases, is far, very far, from having any color of authority in the teachings and facts of Sacred Writ. But contrariwise. 2. That a faith, saving in its character, is anterior to, and therefore incognizant of, any assurance or belief of the subject, as to the fact of his personal acceptance. And,

3. That this faith clearly identifies itself with that which we have heretofore defined as the only thing, under that notion, which can, in the nature of things, fulfill the condition on which God's amnesty grants and assures pardon to the guilty sons of men."

Having concluded the direct argument on the nature of saving faith, two sections are devoted to show "the identity of this only faith which can fulfill the condition of pardon, with the faith implied by our organic law, in the condition of membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church." This is attempted, first, by the *argumentum ad absurdum:* denying that the General Rules imply saving faith in their statement and amplification of the condition of membership, it would follow that the *perfect morality*, and, indeed, the *complete practical Christianity*, required of all who would be members, may be secured and exhibited without saving faith! In other words, that the affections, desires, and intentions, and the habitual manifestations of true religion, may be secured, without the actual attainment of religion itself! This is a very brief, and necessarily imperfect, statement of the absurdity which our author, at considerable length, and with much ingenuity and effect, exhibits in his *argumentum ad absurdum.*

Our author next addresses himself to the task of obviating this very plausible objection to his position:

> That while saving faith, or any other explicit terms of equivalent import, are not employed in the premises, a collation of the historic introduction of the General Rules with the rules themselves affords a strong presumption that the subjects are regarded, not as subjects of saving faith, but as mere aspirants to it.

The "eight or ten persons"—the pattern cases, the *nuclei* of the "United Societies"—came to Mr. Wesley "deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption, desiring him to advise them how to flee from the wrath to come, *which they saw continually hanging over their heads.*" Were these, even at that very time, in the possession of saving faith? If they had justifying faith, would they see the wrath to come continually impending over them? Can it be possible that they were accepted of God at the very time they suffered from such an apprehension of his displeasure?

Mr. Wesley defines such a society as "no other than a com-

pany of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness," etc. Did Mr. Wesley regard them as truly saved already, by the exercise of saving faith? Our author does not in the least appear to shrink from this most critical issue. No mere statement of his method, however, can do justice to his argument. It should be read in full, in order to realize its force. As a specimen merely, we give his answer to that part of the question which refers to those who are represented as having the form, and are seeking the power of godliness:

> To what is specific in this objection we reply specifically: That having the form, and seeking the power of godliness, are properties which very well consist with any measure of saving faith on this side of heaven.

And of the same nature is his remark concerning the other part of the objection:

> So, also, we should think, is "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins."

He relies chiefly upon Mr. Fletcher, however, to give the complete answer to the objection.

To give an idea of our author's direct, incisive style of managing a plausible objection, we furnish a specimen relating to this case of persons "deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption." The objection assumes that they were not Christians, but only seeking to become such.

> To all of which we reply, that whether the data referred to imply the absence or presence of saving faith or not, none can question that they do imply faith of some sort, nor that it was clearly marked, not less by the subjective, than the objective character. To prove this, and more, to repel the whole presumption based upon the whole premises, let us fix upon the first of the historic notices referred to. The subjects of the notice were "deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption." To be convinced of sin is to be convinced of—that is, to have faith, to believe in—one half of all the saving truths of the Bible. To be convinced of redemption through Christ—obviously implied here, as the other is obviously expressed—is to be convinced of—that is, to have faith, to believe in—the other half of all those truths. Here, then, at the outset both of objection and defense, we are met, in these antetypal persons, with the sum total of all that can ever be objective to the faith that brings salvation. More; it was a faith which proved itself to be profoundly and powerfully subjective also. Deeply convinced alike of sin and redemption—that is, heartily believing

both—bitterly grieving for the one, and earnestly groaning for the other, it was nothing less than a believing with the heart. Was it? Whence, then, was its earnest "groaning?" Speaks it of less than a full consent, aye, an unutterable longing to receive that infinite good which, though the "eight or ten" did not, we know that the amnesty of God assured to all, on the simple, sole condition of feeling their need of, and heartily consenting to receive it.

Having disposed of the objections that might be supposed to be fatal, or, at least, seriously damaging to his position, our author now proceeds to establish his principal and final proposition:

That the General Rules, in their statement and amplification of the one only condition of membership, do, fairly and beyond question, imply the faith that is properly saving; which brings eternal salvation to all who keep it to the end.

It is not our purpose to follow the author through this part of his argument. Let it suffice to hear his own statement of what he proposes to do, and how he purposes to accomplish it. His style and method are perhaps already sufficiently indicated.

And we are to do this, as before indicated, by the Word of God, as interpreted and applied by orthodox theologians generally, and by Messrs. Fletcher and Wesley in particular. Our process is simple. Whoever is the subject of the religious life, inward and outward, required by the General Rules as the condition of membership, is judged by the above authorities to be in the possession of saving faith. That he is judged to be so, by plain and undeniable consequence, will appear from the marked agreement of the terms in which they state or imply the nature of saving faith, with the terms in which the General Rules are claimed to imply the same thing.

This part of the argument is remarkably full, clear, and convincing. But it must be read, aye, studied, in order to feel its masterly power. If, previously, we have witnessed our author's consummate generalship in making the attack, we may now witness his more extensive maneuverings, and his veteran prowess, in the general engagement. Some of his guns are planted in commanding positions, and throw their solid shot into the enemy's camp at long range, with rifle precision. Others are ranged in batteries of various caliber, and are intended to do general execution, as the exigencies may necessitate. But he holds in reserve two of his heaviest ordnance, on which he chiefly relies, to complete the victory and to secure his triumph. In this

peculiar contest, these two reserve ordnance have peculiar significance and effect. Their bold initials are "J. W.," "J. F." When the progress of the engagement indicates the appropriate moment, our sagacious polemic unlimbers these two ponderous Methodistic columbiads and lets them do execution. When they speak, it is with a familiar voice and with decisive accent. Whoso or whatsoever is within range, let it or him hasten to escape! The engagement ended, the dust and smoke of the conflict blown away, the *débris* of the battle-field unvailed to the light, we see who has gained the victory, and who has sustained defeat.

We have purposely refrained from any attempt to give the particulars of the main argument. No selection would do it justice, or satisfy the inquisitive. It must be read in its entireness if we would realize its originality and effectiveness.

Our author has appended a second part, embracing various correlative matters. Section I. is entitled, "*What we have found.* We have found true religion—a saving Christianity—*where* it ought to be, and *as* it ought to be." That is, we find it in the condition of membership, as it is expressed and amplified in the General Rules. Section II. "*Our loss and gain, a matter of equal gratulation.*" After giving several items of this loss and gain, consequent upon this new—in reality, this old—primitive doctrine of the requirement of the General Rules, as to the one only condition of membership, our author sums up as follows:

> These, and such like, are the *particulars* of our general loss. Just these, neither more nor less. And we leave the general Church, especially all true sons of Wesley, with Wesley himself, to say whether our loss, in any just sense of it, does more impoverish than it enriches us. If it does not—and who shall say it does not?—then will our discovery, our *re*discovery, of the faith that brings salvation, where, and as it ought to be, be hailed, even for the loss it brings, with emotions such as those which swell the disburdened bosom upon the exchange of "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

It seems hardly necessary, and yet it may be expedient, to say to the attentive reader, that our author fully admits the idea of improvable, progressive faith, just as he, with the Scriptures, with Wesley and Fletcher, recognizes the doctrine of progressive personal Christianity. Indeed, this is the central

idea of the whole treatise. By *saving* faith he does not usually, if ever, mean *mature* faith. He generally, if not always, means the faith of *acceptance*, such as was exhibited by Cornelius. It is not salvation complete, but salvation so far as to secure release from the Divine displeasure, and the condemnation of the violated law. This is necessarily implied in the fact of acceptance; for acceptance and rejection, or condemnation—which is practically the same thing—are manifestly incompatible. But the newly born is yet an infant only; not a man of full stature in Christ. He may, or he may not, enjoy the sense of assurance. That is an advancement toward maturity or completeness, and may be immediate or remote. The thing to be insisted upon is, that those who fear God, and are workers of righteousness, are accepted of God, whatever be their own judgment of themselves or the opinions of others. Having the faith that saves, in the fact of acceptance, but lacking, as yet, perhaps, the faith of assurance, their sensibilities are not the true test of their relations to God, and, judging as things appear to them, their self-judgment may be misjudgment of their actual condition.

In the Methodist Church, we have reason to fear, this phase of experimental religion is too little understood, and receives too little attention. Myriads of most excellent persons, we opine, are lost to the Methodist Church, and gained by others, because they understand and appreciate this very common phase of Christianity better than we do. We give the results of some experience in relation to this matter, and of considerably extensive and careful observation.

Our author's definition of saving faith is full, clear, explicit, and Wesleyan. He not only corrects a widely prevalent misapprehension, but he shows that Mr. Wesley himself, in his maturer views, had occasion to revise his earlier teachings concerning it. Many at first, as now, had the faith of *assurance* in such immediate and practically inseparable connection with the faith of *acceptance*, that they very naturally, but illogically, inferred and taught that they were so nearly identical, or, at least, so inseparable, that whoever had not the faith of assurance must be supposed to be still in a state of unreconciliation with God, and not to be classed among the truly converted. And undoubtedly thousands of God's dear children,

truly penitent, spotlessly sincere, fearing God and working righteousness, and, consequently, accepted of him, have been discouraged, repelled, and perhaps fatally injured, by such teachings and by such treatment. We cannot mistake the *animus* of this very unique dissertation. The author is not in conflict with an imaginary foe. He is not contending for contention's sake. He is a man of extensive research, of large experience as preacher and administrator, of deep religious concern for the welfare of the Church, and one who sees with his own eyes, and does his own thinking. During his half century's ministerial life and observations he has discovered—what he has exhibited and demonstrated in his treatise—a widely prevalent, a very injurious misapprehension, unavoidably leading to fatally erroneous judgments and practices concerning the fundamental principles of evangelical Christianity; and, with godly zeal and earnestness, he has set himself to the task of correcting the misjudgment and error, for the sake of the many ten thousands of our Israel whose hearts have been made sad, whom God has not made sad. This confusion of thought, that confounds, or, at least, inseparably associates justifying faith with the faith of assurance, is a much more serious mistake than many suppose. And the error is as un-Wesleyan as it is unscriptural.

In these days of assumed superior intelligence concerning the "higher life," as the indefinite, modern phrase is, how low and unappreciative the common estimate of that state of grace that does not exhibit, and cannot, therefore, profess the faith of assurance. All the tendencies seem to be toward depreciation. It seems to be the period of despising "the day of small things." Many very zealous, and equally injudicious instructors, with less consideration than earnestness, deem it warrantable to press constitutionally careful and deeply conscientious Christians to claim, and, without the experience, to profess, the very highest gracious attainments; to profess, not because they have the experience of what must be, in the very nature of the case, experimental; not because they have received the witness of the Spirit to that specific state of grace; (if, indeed, the Spirit usually, or ever, witnesses to that specific condition:) but to profess, forsooth, because they have sincerely, and, so far as they know, fully surrendered, or consecrated, themselves

to the Lord. Thus virtually, as near as it can be logically stated, basing the assurance of their high attainment upon the entireness and perfection of their own doings, as having fully complied with the requisite condition.* And all this, as we think, in the interest, and in consequence of this fatal misimpression, that a state of grace is of little value, and less than saving, if unaccompanied by the assurance of it, and, even if attained, cannot be retained without the assurance nor without the profession. In other words, that the grace of assurance must be associated with the grace that saves. Indeed, no matter how God-fearing, nor how righteously living, unless a man have and profess the faith of assurance, he is scarcely accounted a believer at all, and considered, perhaps, in a state of unbelief and peril.

It is well known that Mr. Wesley, following the Apostle Paul, was accustomed to speak of a difference among Christians, in relation to their sensible attainments, as the difference between a *servant* and a *son*. But the servant that Paul and Wesley had in view was not a bond or hired servant, but was, in fact, both a *child* and *heir*, (Gal. iv, 1.) He was regarded as a servant only because he was *under age*. Is not this scriptural and primitively Wesleyan distinction now practically obsolete? Are we not in danger of becoming wise above what is written? Is not the dividing line between God's people and those who are not, drawn without due consideration? A man must be consciously and confessedly a child of God, or he must be a child of the devil! By no means. He must be a full grown man, else he is not even a babe! How unscriptural! How unmethodistic! By many the faith that is not conjoined with assurance is estimated as little less than absolute unbelief! Our author presses upon this fatal error with irresistible effect. He returns to it again and again with additional force, and leaves nothing unsaid that may legitimately bear upon this point. If there were nothing else contained in this treatise, this luminous, timely exhibition of evangelical truth would make the book invaluable.

With much other testimony to the same effect, we find this extract, containing Mr. Wesley's maturest convictions on this momentous question:

* See Foster on Christian Purity. Especially page 206.

Indeed, nearly fifty years ago, when the preachers, commonly called Methodist, began to preach that grand scriptural doctrine, salvation by faith, they were not sufficiently apprised of the difference between a *servant* and a *child* of God. They did not clearly understand that even one "that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." In consequence of this they were apt to make sad the hearts of those whom God had not made sad; for they frequently asked those who feared God, "Do you know your sins forgiven?" And upon their answering "No," immediately replied, "Then you are a child of the devil." No, that does not follow. It might have been said, and it is all that can be said with propriety, "Hitherto you are only a *servant*, you are not a *child* of God." (As before explained.) "You have already great reason to praise God that he has called you to his honorable service. Fear not. Continue crying to him, and you shall see greater things than these."

It is an old adage, "History repeats itself." It may differ in species, while the genus remains the same. There is still the same tendency to oscillate beyond the truthful medium to the opposite extreme of the arc. If it relates not to one state of grace, it may to another.

At the risk of redundancy, we recur to the question last under our notice, to repeat that Mr. Wesley, with the apostle, did not consider these "servants" as aliens and strangers, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. But they had not attained the full age so as to be treated in all respects as "sons." Because "the *heir*, as long as he is a *child*, differeth nothing from a *servant*, though he be lord of all." It was customary for the original instructors of Methodism to apply this scriptural illustration to explain the progressive states of grace, from the new birth to full Christian maturity. These *servants* were the younger children of the same divine parentage; not to be discouraged and repelled, as if they were strangers and foreigners, because they were not full grown at their birth, but to be regarded with unusual affection and tenderness, and encouraged to cultivate the germs of saving grace until they should realize the blessedness of riper and richer Christian experience. Does not the great present necessity in Church teaching lie in this direction? In our zeal to fulfill the great mission, "to spread scriptural holiness over these lands," are we not in danger of magnifying one feature of the great salvation to the disfigurement and damage of another?

As if there could be a completion without a beginning; a maturity without an incipiency; the full manhood without the imperfect childhood. The nursery is not less needful than the university.

Whether, in doctrinal views and in theories and methods, the modern Methodists are superior to the primitive, may at least admit of a question. In the prominence that we give to wonderful experiences, and especially in the tendency to religious caste which seems to attend the efforts to promote the higher life, there is danger of undervaluing the spiritual attainments of those who do not come up to our measures or our methods, and perhaps sincerely doubt the propriety or the practical value of both. There are in all the evangelical Churches multitudes who come under this classification, and among them, in numbers equal proportionally to the membership of our own Church, may be found the humble, the self-denying, the cross-bearing, the sweet-spirited, the habitually prayerful, the eminently useful, and, in every sense, the equals of the similar grades in our own Church. Yet nothing is more common than utterances concerning Christian experience that would not only exclude them from the higher degrees of religious fellowship, but even from the lower gradations in the family of God, and perhaps from heaven itself, if human judgment should be the revelation of God's. The statement is sufficiently startling, and it is not without sufficient proof.

While it may be admitted, perhaps, that occasionally an individual, or even a group of them, may be brought into or retained in the Methodist Church in consequence of this peculiar state of things, it is undoubtedly equally true that hundreds, aye, thousands, are kept from the Church, or repelled from it, or effectually lost to the Church, even while nominally remaining within it, in consequence of this same condition of things. We are impressed that there is too little value attached to what may be called the lower grades of experimental Christianity, and undue prominence given to what may be denominated the higher. In our zeal to exhibit and maintain the higher experiences, in the common measures and professions peculiar to that department, we—perhaps unintentionally—make the impression that "the desire to flee

from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins," the fearing of the Lord and the working of righteousness, as a distinguishing grade or class, is of little account, and hardly, if at all, to be considered as a state of salvation. We are so impressed with the value of fully matured Christian character that we seem to forget the promising beginnings of grace. The "full corn in the ear" is so highly prized that we little appreciate the order of both providence and grace, that there should be "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." We lack the "*patience* of faith." In respect of these things is there not room for improvement?

The chief intention of the treatise under notice is, manifestly, to check this growing tendency, so far as it can be done. It is an earnest, a truly Methodistic and masterly appeal for the Lord's little ones. It could not well have emanated from a better source, or from one who has had better opportunities for knowing whereof he affirms. Let the whole Church pause and listen, and practically heed.

In connection, and not irrelevantly, we may respectfully inquire whether our Church is consistent with her own teachings in the matter of admitting to membership, even according to the usual understanding of the General Rules. The Rules proclaim, "*There is only one condition.*" In that only condition there is nothing expressed, or naturally implied, in relation to agreement in doctrines as they are promulgated in the Articles of Religion. Provided there is conformity in respect of the things which are particularized, there is nothing whatever in respect of belief that can constitutionally keep or exclude from membership. By what legitimate authority, then, does the administrator meet the duly recommended and the duly probationed applicant at the door of the Church and demand of him, Do you believe in the doctrines of the Holy Scripture *as they are set forth in the Articles of Religion in the Methodist Episcopal Church?*

Is this, or is it not, *another* condition of membership? If it is expressed, or if it is naturally implied in the *only one condition*, then let us inquire, How? Where? In what connection? If full conformity of *belief* is indeed a *new* and *another* condition, superadded to the *only one* of the General Rules; then, by what authority? Is it not sufficiently mani-

fest to all who are not unwilling to see, that consistency requires either a change of the General Rules, or the annulment of this part of the form for the reception of members? Suppose a person, in every thing else entirely unexceptionable—a person who gives all reasonable evidences of being a Christian, a child of God, a member of the body of Christ—such a person, providentially brought into neighborly associations with a Methodist Church, and, for companion's sake, for children's sake, or for any other good reason, desiring or consenting to become a member, but still not quite ready to assent to some of the doctrines formulated in the Articles, holding, as millions of duly accredited Christians of other Churches do, doctrines not recognized as Methodistic, what should be done in such a case? Indeed, what *must* be done to be in accord with the General Rules, which are *de facto* the constitution of the Church so far as it relates to membership? After due probation and official recommendation; after giving every requisite proof of a desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from sin, and thus fulfilling the one only condition, the applicant presents himself for reception in due form. And now he is confronted with the *other condition.* Now, by what constitutional, or by what other Christian authority, is the door of the Church closed in the face of such a one? Conformity of belief is not only not required by the General Rules, but, as a prerequisite for membership, is directly and flatly in contradiction. It is neither in accordance with Wesley's remarkable catholicity, nor in agreement with original Methodist practice. And it is absolutely shocking, if we contemplate it in cases which may occur almost any day, and are, in fact, continually occurring. Who can read Mr. Wesley's utterances in some of his sermons without being impressed that we have departed from the catholicity that characterized the origin of the Methodist Church? A man must now *be* more, and *do* more, and *profess* more, and *believe* more than primitively in order to attain to membership in the Church. And this, in these encouraging days of almost millennial advancement toward universal fraternization among mutually recognized Christians! The candidate for membership, otherwise entirely acceptable, must be stretched, or clipped, as the occasion may indicate, to the exact formulated measure of our

dogmatic Procrustean bed! And this, too, while the only one condition of the General Rules is generally understood not to express or imply *saving faith!* He can be admitted without salvation, but not without believing our creed!

Is this progress in the right direction? or is it manifestly in the opposite? To what is it infallibly tending? If unchecked, what must be its approaching ultimate? There is hope for a man only so long as he is willing to be convinced of actual error, and has grace and good sense enough to be corrected when so convicted. What is true of the individual man, is doubtless equally true of associated men, whether in municipal or ecclesiastical relations. There is only one Church that claims immutability, and refuses to be convinced of error or of such a liability. Let not denominational vanity impel us to the assumption of virtual infallibility, lest we fall into the arrogant pretensions and the unchristian abominations of Romanism. Wesley, the venerable, was not unwilling to revise the immature opinions and teachings of Wesley, the junior. Let not the admiring followers of that great and good man be ashamed to imitate their father in the Gospel, and, with all lowliness and teachableness, eliminate errors that may have crept in unawares, and strive only for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Assuming that the only one condition of membership does not express or imply saving faith, there is another instance of inconsistency in the matter of receiving into membership that is of singular, and even startling, pertinency to this discussion. It seems surprising that our author did not make effective use of it in his argument. Among the questions which the candidate is required to answer affirmatively is this: "Have you saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ?" Now, we present the case in this dilemmic form: Saving faith either is, or it is not, embraced in the only one condition of membership. If it is, then our author's position is soundly Methodistic, and his argument a triumphant success. If it is not, then by what constitutional authority do we meet the applicants with such a demand? If saving faith is not implied in the only one condition, then, manifestly, here is another condition; and that authoritative proclamation that there is only one condition previously required is untrue, and Church membership is based upon a

palpable falsehood. Is there any possible way to evade this startling conclusion?

Is it not time for the Church to institute a thorough investigation of this whole matter, and to authorize and ordain such disciplinary revisions as consistency may require? We ought to be so unmistakably definite in all our disciplinary teachings, especially concerning matters peculiar and essential, that there should be no occasion for misunderstanding among ourselves. If we have specific convictions, we can employ definite language to express them.

This remarkable production of the venerable Dr. Chamberlayne seems to be providentially opportune. It is not issued one moment too soon. Too long have we been occupied with matters comparatively trivial. Here is something organic and vital that needs attention. Correcting our misimpressions and differences concerning the doctrines of the Church, let it be at the same time ordained that the constitution and usages of the Church shall be in harmony. And let us not be unheedful to the true prophet, even if his utterances should startle and disturb us. The truth is what we should earnestly contend for, no matter from what mirror it may be reflected to us from the original source. Truth has nothing to fear from the most searching investigation. Truth courts the earnest conflict, and grapples with error without dismay. Truth is mighty and must prevail. But this very victory implies conflict and struggle.

One word further relative to this timely treatise: Our conviction is, that it should be at once adopted by the proper authorities, and put on the list of preparative ministerial studies. Our conviction results from several considerations:

1. The vital importance of the subjects discussed.

2. The demonstrable fact of the prevalence of injurious misimpressions in relation to these essential matters.

3. The faithful exhibition of these erroneous misimpressions, and the clear, logical, Methodistic demonstration of the truth, in this little volume.

4. The value of the book in the cultivation of mental discipline. For this purpose it is, in many respects, the equal of "Butler's Analogy."

5. Its adaptation to check the present alarming tendency to

unduly magnify one phase or grade of religious experience, to the depreciation and damage of another.

6. The concurrent convictions of many of the eminent men of our Church, who well understand the present state of things, and the character and practical value of this treatise.

(1.) Our venerable and senior bishop pronounces this "an able treatise by a master logician; one of exceeding interest to all evangelical Christians."

(2.) Another eminent author and divine says: "As a contribution to positive theology, I have never met its superior, perhaps I should say its equal. In settling the true idea, the '*rationale*' of saving faith, and the distinction between it and the 'faith of assurance,' a flood of light has been let in upon the true meaning of the conditions of salvation, as fixed by the Divine Lord and Master in all the varied dispensations. How much evil judging, false teaching, and indefensible and ambiguous preaching this will correct and prevent, need not here be intimated. . . . No man is prepared for the Methodist ministry without a knowledge of the polemic history of our Church, and no theological student of any Church can afford to omit the careful study of Dr. Chamberlayne's treatise on 'Saving Faith.' It will go far toward settling some of the most abstruse and most contested points in psychological theology, and I wish for it a general reading, as well for the unity of Methodism, as for the better understanding between Methodists and Calvinists."

(3.) Another, now a bishop, and eminent both as a preacher and author, writes: "Whoever wishes to see a bold, well conceived advance, beyond all precedent, in the study of a great theme, and to feel the unified beauty, perspicuity, and strength of the English language, may read this work with a perfect certainty of very high satisfaction."

(4.) Another titled divine, formerly one of our official editors, says, with other commendations: "A work like this has been long needed by the Church, and especially by her pastors and teachers; and it is a matter of rejoicing that the lack hitherto felt is now supplied by one so competent for the task as Dr. Chamberlayne."

(5.) Another of our best informed, venerable divines, after fully indorsing and commending the work, adds: "Preachers,

and especially young pastors, will find this beautiful volume a real *vade mecum*. There will be times when, in their efforts to 'comfort the feeble-minded,' the teachings found herein will be of priceless value."

(6.) In a card published by a constellation of eminent pastors, with much other commendation, the closing words declare, "We feel assured that the publication and general circulation of your work would serve to supply an important *desideratum* in our Church theology, and that it would eminently contribute to accurate and satisfactory views of the Christian life."

Excepting a very limited number, this treatise on "Saving Faith" might be allowed to displace almost any book in the ministerial course of study, with immediate and permanent advantage to the Church. In this little book, treating of matters vitally essential to the Church, we have the crystallized thoughts of one of the profoundest thinkers of the present age.

Art. VI.—THE RESURRECTION.

"In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."—1 Cor. xv, 52, 53.

I. The text announces a profound mystery, and one that affects every human creature. No matter how remote in the past he may have lived, or how widely scattered in the present, or how distant in the future, every human being, that has been, or that now is, or that will be, in this great mystery is to have a common destiny—the flesh is to be raised or changed to immortality. "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the DEAD shall be RAISED INCORRUPTIBLE, and we shall be changed." The living and the dead are to meet incorruptible. "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality:" the living to be changed into immortality and incorruptibility, and the dead to be RAISED incorruptible. And all in a moment. It is therefore no law process, nor life process, nor death process. It is the fiat of Almighty God, "making all things new." It is done in the

twinkling of an eye. Not as one dies; not as one lives; not as law, either in the moral or natural world, moves; but "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." Not now, but "at the last trump;" then the dead shall be raised, and the living changed. This, indeed, is mystery—mystery full of grandeur; mystery over which hangs the cloud from which emanates glory inconceivable and darkness indescribable. But mystery we concede that it is, and one entirely beyond the reach of reason, however pure or however strong. It needs the clear announcement of revelation to establish it. And this revelation we have; and the very clearness of the terms, and of the ideas thrown out in the terms, is proof of the Divine origin both of the words used and of the awful fiat, yet to come, announced in them. We take, therefore, the communication, so clear, so grand, so sublime, as proof of the presence of the Mind which alone could make to the world such an announcement. Man could not do this, because he reasons from premises within his grasp, which this is not. Angels could not discover this. God alone could be the author of so clear a revelation of the resurrection of the dead.

And here we ought to make another preliminary point. It is this: The fact that some things in connection with the resurrection of the dead are unrevealed, and are yet in darkness to the human mind, does not invalidate what is revealed. The fact that the continent of America lay hidden from Europe till seen by Columbus did not render Europe, that was seen, unreal. This fact that half the world only was revealed did not render less certain that which was known. And yet the mere fact that a vast continent lay embosomed between two seas, but unknown to the world, may have rendered it impossible to form correct views of the geography of the whole earth; but this circumstance did not render uncertain a single river, sea, mountain, hillock, or aught else that was seen. Neither did it render uncertain that which was not seen. The unknown was equally true with the known. So of the resurrection of the dead. Standing by some sea-shore I may perceive clearly in the distance an island upon which rises in beautiful proportions a lofty light-house, so clear, so distinct, so lofty, none can mistake. But if a bystander should ask me, "Of what material is the building," I could only say,

"I know not, but it looks incorruptible." This uncertainty in the one case does not affect the fact, of vastly higher grandeur, that the *light-house is there* and the architect declares it imperishable. So a man might ask me of the shore of the island—if there were herbage there; what the rock on which this glorious superstructure was, gneiss, or granite or solid crystal?—and to all the questions I must be silent. Yet there stands the noble structure, still performing its work of guiding and saving, as perfectly, as beautifully, as wisely, as though every rock and hillock, and all the surroundings, were known like familiar household words. Though God had hidden every fact from the universe save one, and that his own being, his own being would have been as much a truth as though all else had been revealed. Thus it is with the resurrection of the dead.

But, says the objector, my difficulty lies in another direction. From the fact that wheat grows luxuriantly upon the battle-field, and that men are sometimes cannibals, and that changes are taking place constantly in all human bodies, it seems apparent to me that the resurrection is an impossibility that is absolute. I cannot believe it.

How can these objections be obviated? Let us make the effort:

1. It will be seen at once that, of the vast amount consumed by an individual in a life-time or in a day, but the merest particles are retained by the system. An infant that consumes from six hundred to a thousand pounds a year will perhaps retain of that large amount ten pounds. The mother, or the cow, or the goat that yields this amount will lose nothing. The cow that yields nine thousand five hundred and fifty-six pounds of milk per year loses nothing herself; she is simply a large manufacturer. Give her good material, and she will, perchance, increase her own weight by the means, and remain as intact as the mill that grinds out your corn. An adult that consumes, it may be, in a year, two thousand pounds, more or less, may not retain in the system a single pound. Much that he did take was pure water or fluid, which *never* incorporates itself into the system at all.

2. In the second place, the difficulties lessen by a reference to what is probably the true theory of life, which is this: The

human body, as it first appears in life, consists of "innumerable membranes, exquisitely thin, that are filled with circulating fluids, to which the solid parts bear a very small proportion." "Into the tubes composed of these membranes nourishment must be continually infused; otherwise, life cannot continue, but will come to an end almost as soon as it is begun. And suppose this nourishment to be liquid, which, as it flows through those fine canals, continually enlarges them in all their dimensions; yet it contains innumerable solid particles, which continually adhere to the inner surface of the vessels through which they flow; so that in proportion as any vessel is enlarged it is stiffened also. Thus the body grows firmer as it grows larger, from infancy to manhood. In twenty, five and twenty, or thirty years, it attains its full measure of firmness. Every part of the body is stiffened then to its full degree; as much earth adhering to all the vessels as gives the solidity they severally need to the nerves, arteries, veins, muscles, in order to exercise their functions in the most perfect manner." At length life is filled up; its wants are met. Stiffened now to excess, wrinkles appear, age comes on, and death ensues—apparently by the very means ordained for life. But a deduction of the theory is this: Much that appears to be of the body is not of the body. The other day I took up a piece of sponge, then dry, and weighed it, and found it to weigh about an ounce. I immersed it in water, and again weighed it, and found it more than ten times its former weight. I compressed it, and again filled it—compressed and filled—but there remained the sponge, as at first seen. Thus, too, I have seen one of our New England mills. The pond would sometimes be *full* to excess, sometimes low; sometimes the mill would go fast or slow, till the pond dried up, and the mill stayed its movement; but yet the mill stood in its glory, and so remained, whether the tide was up or down. The body bears a similar relation to much that passes through it.

3. One other remark may be made, which will lessen the real difficulties of the case. Human bodies have from the beginning been divinely regarded as *sacred*, and they have been sacredly cared for. The mass of humanity lies safely interred beneath the ground, so as really to be unaffected by what passes above it. So do those, doubtless, whose burying place was the

deep sea. They lie far down, where *life* goes not—down in its awful depths, where no disturbing influences shall reach them, "till the sea gives up its dead, and they shall stand before God." And if some have been crushed by the monsters of the deep, and others consumed by the beasts of the wilderness, yet the dust of each may be as safely deposited, the one in the depths of the sea, the other in the earth, as though sealed up in a metallic urn, only to be opened at the resurrection at the last day.

4. So far as the objection lies against the doctrine of the resurrection from *changes* supposed to take place in the whole body in a term of years, we reply: (1.) The theory we propose does not admit of these immense changes. We say they do not take place. They never did take place. (2.) Recent microscopic discovery admits that that which was supposed to be change in the substance of the body is but the change incident to the reception and rejection of want and supply, and not invading the integrity of the system at all.

5. But after all it may be asked, If there be but *one* human body exposed to some of the objections here named, and the resurrection is to be *universal*, will not the objection lie against *that one* as broadly as against the whole? We answer, Yes, unless you make an exception of *this one* to the great fiat that shall give life to the rest. But there is no necessity of this resort; and we have only attempted to meet the objections heretofore met, so as to help the weakness of the understanding till it should bow itself without reserve to faith—faith in the divine word; faith in the power of God, and in Jesus Christ, our adorable Lord, at whose voice the dead shall rise.

But to all objections raised against the doctrine of a literal resurrection—a resurrection, however, that admits of a *change* into immortality and incorruptibility; a change from weakness to power, from dishonor to honor, from corruption to glory—we answer that such as have any solid basis may be met by the following considerations: (1.) God is ABLE to *preserve every particular human body intact*, or free from all other bodies. Now, if able to do this, and if he has pledged his word for it, will he not do it? Can he not keep as safely, as separate, every particle of dust as can the chemist his minerals in his laboratory? Cannot the chemist separate them, even if they become

mixed? Cannot God do with all matter in his laboratory what the chemist can do in his? The question, of course, answers itself to every intelligent mind. (2.) It has been assumed by a philosopher as well as a divine of our own country that there is a substance belonging to matter unaffected by any test, and perfectly indestructible, that this substance is found in the human body, and that this becomes the basis of the resurrection body, thus securing the identity to every body. (3.) But we remark, in the third place, that some years since, while trying to solve the problems connected with this subject, in looking out upon the natural world we saw that all organic matter seemed endowed with a remarkable power of *self-preservation* —a LAW OF IDENTITY, that looked out for itself, even at the expense of its own existence. It seemed purely instinctive, but universal, and as controlling as mechanical law. It was a power that wrought self-preservation, or *death* as an alternative. In other words, it fought for life, pure life—for its own structure—till it conquered, or fell a martyr to its fidelity. Thus in a field of wheat, when the grain has absorbed what was appropriate for its life it *will absorb no more; it will die.* Sooner than to *absorb* an improper article it would die; die half-grown—die anywhere, rather than absorb any matter not congenial to its life. Take the wheat away and plant something else, an article that lives on other elements, and that could grow luxuriantly. Take the beech-tree, the maple, hemlock, moosewood, pine —they all live on elements peculiar to themselves. The one will grow where the other will not. The same law is found in the animal creation; were it only the butterfly or silk-worm, each must have its appropriate food or it soon dies. Moreover, when some of these animals feed in the same field, the one takes the properties which constitute the flesh of birds, or of sheep, or of oxen; all evidently being endowed with a power, when living upon what seemed the same food, to cull, each for itself, the element adapted to its own structure and growth; and when it cannot get this, it will feed on itself for a while, and then die. Man seems endowed with the same power. Nature culls for itself what is most appropriate, "giving not only to the seed *its* own body," but what is proper for man. Give him arsenicum, and he resists it till he dies. Give him alcohol—and nature will not incorporate that

article into the system. It is thus with a vast variety of substances: man cannot endure them; he has no affinity for them. Now this law of identity is every-where. The law is this: *Every individual nature possesses power which appropriates to itself that which is essential to its own existence, and defends itself from all else.* And in man, as in each seed, that power appropriates to each body what is appropriate to itself, and defends it from all other substances. Water purifies itself. It will keep only what belongs to itself. And this law gives to every spear of grass its color, differing somewhat from its fellows; it spots the delicate flower with green, blue, red, or violet; and, while it gives the luster to the insect's wing, it may be said that "it wheels its throne on rolling worlds." But this law secures *sacredness—identity*—to all organic matter. It secures it to man, and by it every human body is preserved intact; even the fragments are gathered up, and nothing is lost. This law of identity is a wonderful property. The snail has it; the bee has it; the humming-bird, the eagle, every beast of the forest, has the endowment; every tree, every flower, all that live, possess it. And we cannot hesitate to attribute it to man. *He is a sacred being*, "purchased not with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ;" and, though sifted like as corn is sifted in a sieve, "yet shall not the least grain perish." The body which Nature gives to him she keeps, as no sentinel could keep it, till the morn of the resurrection, when its work is done and she surrenders, as a faithful watcher, that which had been committed to her charge, to the fiat which says, "Behold I make all things new."

II. What, then, are the true grounds of hope for the resurrection of the dead?

1. The whole fabric rests upon the resurrection of Christ. If Christ be raised, then shall there be a resurrection of the dead. "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." Either, from the apostle's argument, there shall be a resurrection of the dead, or we have *no risen Christ.* And if Christ be not risen, no man has been forgiven; we are yet in our sins; and they who are fallen asleep in Christ have *perished.* The apostles also are false witnesses, even Paul himself, and the Gospel a deception.

Now, that Christ *is* risen is an outstanding fact in the world's history, so palpable that, if it be not demonstrated, you can demonstrate no fact by witness. No fact could be proved in a court of justice, if it be not proved that Christ rose from the dead. Four historians declare the fact, who were eye-witnesses of his majesty. Twelve men declare it; five hundred men saw Christ at the same time, and affirmed his resurrection, even at the cost of life. A bitter persecutor sees him, abandons every life-interest for the truth, becomes its proclaimer, and dies a martyr to his fidelity, exclaiming, as he dies, "I have kept the faith;" and for this faith he dies.

But how, it may be asked, does the resurrection of Christ demonstrate the resurrection of the dead? We answer: Were it a question whether or not, in the first period of the world, man would die, there might have been doubts in regard to it. True, God had said, "Thou shalt surely die; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Nevertheless men might doubt—ridicule, even—such an idea, for such a phenomenon was unknown. No man had seen a reality so fearful to God's highest work. It was impossible as well as incredible, one might say. But when it was seen that "Abel gave up the ghost" and crumbled back to earth, there could be no longer a doubt that man *could die;* and if one law covered the race, all must yield to the terrible *fiat*—and so it has proved: all men are mortal.

Now were it a question whether or not the *dead will be raised*, and it comes to pass that *one is raised*—a clearly attested fact—it surely demonstrates the fact that the resurrection of the human body is not only a possibility but a reality. *It has become a patent fact:* a human body is raised. All solid objections from that hour should cease—that is, if this *were* a human body, flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, and especially if "touched with the feelings of our infirmities." But all this is a reality, demonstrated by witnesses the most perfect that ever attested any cause or case since man was upon the earth, and surrounded by circumstances that absolutely prevented collusion or deception, had the witnesses been never so inclined to it.

But yet the inquirer asks, How does this single fact settle the question? The fact shows that *humanity* is raised;

humanity is *alive*—in glory. And if this fact bears the same relation to the masses as does the first sheaf to the general harvest, the work is sure; for the first sheaf could not be gathered till the harvest had reached the point that *placed the whole beyond accident.* The harvest was as certain as "the *first-fruits* of them which slept."

But there is another view to be taken of the subject. Does Christ bear to the world SPIRITUALLY the same relation that *Adam* bears to the human race *naturally?* Is Christ a second Adam, as well as Lord from heaven? And as *death* came *by one*, the first Adam; so the resurrection came by *one man*, even Christ. Is Christ the spiritual head of the race? Are they his by covenant, as they were the children of the first Adam by natural descent? "The Father hath given all things into his hand." So the text reads; so the Bible assures; so the apostle argues. He believed it; why should not we? As sure, then, as death falls upon man by Adam, by his connection with him as head of the race, so truly will come upon man the resurrection of the dead: BUT *every man in his own order*, Christ the "first-fruits;" afterward they that *are* Christ's AT HIS COMING. *Then* follows the end.

But there is another sense in which the resurrection of Christ demonstrates the resurrection of the masses. It is this: Christ had predicted his own death, and his resurrection the third day. And this was to be the result of his own power. He laid down his life; he was to take it again. If the event followed as predicted by him, it demonstrated both the TRUTH of his *prediction* and his *power* over the grave. It demonstrates the truth of all Christ's sayings, of Christ's power of Christ's Messiahship, of his High Priesthood. It was the inaugurating seal to his office as Mediator at the right hand of the throne in the heavens. Now Christ had not only said that the Son of Man shoud be crucified, and should rise again the third day; he had also said, "Marvel *not at this*, for verily, verily I say unto you, all that are in their graves shall *come forth;* they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." The fulfillment of the first demonstrates the fulfillment of the other. If the first has proved a truth, the other must be true. He who could raise himself from the tomb, though

dead, can surely raise his brother. Not only does his truth pledge it, but the very laws of our common humanity or connection with universal humanity, secure it to us. I shall live *because Christ lives.* And if one arrogate to himself hope of salvation on this account, let him remember that Christ is nowhere *unjust.* He will reward every man according to his working, as truly as though not raised. Himself has declared that all in the graves shall come forth; "they that have done good to the resurrection of life; [but] they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation."

2. Another indication of the resurrection is found in the *common instincts of man's nature.* We have said that the doctrine of the resurrection was beyond reason, even in its greatest strength. But some things not to be *revealed* by reason, that may be strengthened by it, are yet indicated by instinct. The dove will find its home, though thousands of miles away, even over a trackless sea. Now, what makes a man tread so softly by the bedside of the dying? Even a stranger will do this, if the dying were a babe. Why is it thus? Not only for the dying, but for the dead, man has the same instinctive feeling. Why does he lay the dead aside so carefully? make preparation to embalm the *body*, when he doubts not the soul has fled? Why a preparation to last thousands of years, such as was made in Egypt; where, according to Herodotus, the doctrine of the soul's immortality first appeared? Why this *care of the body?* Now, Herodotus wrote before Christ four hundred and fifty years. He had no modern notions. Neither had Homer, a thousand years before Christ. They both believed in the soul's immortality. But why this care for the body? Why did Joseph take an oath of the children of Israel that they should remove his body to the land of Canaan a century after his death? No rational account can be given of these instinctive feelings but by allowing that they foreshadowed the sacredness of the body, and that it will again be wanted by its owner. The cenotaphs of Egypt, the records of all the ancient world, the warm, throbbing instinct of every human heart, declare impressively that there shall be a *resurrection of the dead.*

3. But we add to these proofs the express declaration of the word of God. We appendd not one word of comment. If

these declarations do not disclose the doctrine, there are no words in either the Hebrew, Greek, or English languages that can disclose it. But the words *have disclosed the doctrine.* It was outspoken in Egypt, in Greece, and in Persia; but here stand the "words" "the Holy Ghost hath chosen;" and there is but *one alternative* if the Bible be of God, and that is, that *either* the Holy Ghost has selected words that have deceived the pious in all ages, *or* he has declared "THERE WILL BE A RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD."

ART. VII.—AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF MATTER; THE CAUSES OF ITS PROPERTIES, AND THE RELATIONS OF INORGANIC TO ORGANIC FORCES.

THE able works which have appeared upon the Correlation and Conservation of Forces, the Origin of Species, the Rhythmical Development of the Universe, and upon kindred subjects, so far from settling the questions involved in them, have only partially and obscurely opened them to general appreciation. What is force? What is matter? What causes its properties? These are questions which still remain unanswered. The discussion of these subjects is now in such a state as shows more than ever the necessity for careful experimental investigation, and for vigorous scientific discussion, in order to establish the fundamental principles of physical and philosophical research. Until this is done real progress must be doubtful; the mirage of fancy will often be mistaken for the solid ground of reality.

Many years ago the present inquirer, desirous of penetrating the mystery which, to his vision, enshrouded the cause of the properties of matter, and believing that nature would answer the questions of the most humble as readily and truly as those of the most exalted, with slender means and rather rude apparatus undertook a series of experiments to determine what matter was, and how it acted. Ignorant of what the world had achieved in scientific investigation, and supposing that only to himself the results he obtained were new, he made nothing

concerning them more public than to allude to them in class exercises and school lectures. A very brief statement of the experiments appealed to, and of the more important conclusions derived from them, in the order in which they were reached, will furnish the best means of judging whether or not they shed any light on the subject under discussion.

The first set of experiments consisted of attempts to diminish the bulk of *solids* by pressure. Cylinders of various mineral substances were carefully formed and experimented upon. After many failures, and overcoming many difficulties, success was so far attained as to show, uniformly, the following results, namely:

1. The bulk of each substance tried could be diminished by pressure.

2. To produce an equal diminution of bulk each substance required a different pressure.

3. The diminution of bulk in the same substance increased as the pressure increased.

4. On removing the pressure each cylinder instantly regained its former length.

5. Inelastic bodies, as lead, exhibited these phenomena as readily as those which are elastic.

In these experiments the only possible effect of the pressure was to force the atoms of the cylinder nearer to each other. But, as great force was required to make this condensation perceptible in cylinders one third of an inch diameter and one inch and a half long, there must have been an equally great opposing force to be overcome. There was nothing present to exert this opposing force but the atoms of the cylinder compressed. Again, to produce the effects observed, this force must have been exerted outward in every direction from the center of each atom. The fact that, as soon as the pressure was removed, the atoms were pushed apart again, so as to cause the body to attain its original bulk, completes the evidence that, when the atoms of a solid are forced nearer together than they ordinarily are, they *repel* one another. As the amount of this compression and expansion increases with every addition of pressing force which has yet been tried, and as the repellent force must always be equal to the force which

it balances, it follows that this repellent force must be greater than any mechanical force yet experimented with. Omitting further reference to this last deduction, and generalizing the one preceding, we have the following statement, namely:

Within the limits of a very minute, concentric, spherical or spheroidal space, every atom of matter *repels* every other atom. For the sake of brevity, let this space and action be called a *Sphere of Repellent Force.*

Another set of experiments followed, consisting of an attempt to increase the length of rods and wires of different substances. The following results were obtained with a moderate force:

1. Every substance tried, even a glass thread, could be stretched perceptibly.

2. The force required to produce visible lengthening was different for each substance.

3. As the strain was removed each substance contracted to its original length.

4. Increased strain produced increased distension.

In these experiments, as well as in the previous series, care was taken that neither the strain nor the pressure should, in any case, be sufficient to produce any permanent change of form or structure in the body experimented upon.

Reasoning on these results, as on those from compression, it appears that, within a certain hollow spherical or spheroidal space, concentric with the sphere of repellent force and outside of it, every atom of matter *attracts* every other atom. For the sake of brevity, let this shell be called a *Sphere of Attractive Force.*

Now, as force is required to move the atoms of a body either nearer together or further apart than they ordinarily are, it is manifest that, in their ordinary positions, they must be acted upon by equal forces in opposite directions. The following diagram represents this result as a consequence of the deductions already made:

Let A and B represent two atoms; the arrows a a and R R the attractive and repellent forces of each, and the arrow-heads the direction and limits of the action of these forces.



In considering this figure, it is plain that the repellent force of one atom must act in the same direction as the attractive force of the other, and that both tend toward the same result. If the atoms be forced nearer together, the repellent forces must overpower the attractive and drive them apart again; if they are removed further apart they are beyond the limits of the repellent forces, and must be drawn together by the attractive forces. The adjacent figures represent both of these positions. The atoms can rest only when these forces are in equilibrium, as represented in the previous figure.



Further, as the tendencies of all the forces are to restore the atoms to the position of equilibrium, whether they be removed further apart by traction or brought nearer together by compression, it follows that this equilibrium is *stable*. Hence, between the spheres of repellent and attractive forces there is another concentric hollow sphere, denoted by *s* in the figures, in which these forces are in stable equilibrium. Let this hollow sphere or spheroid be called a *Sphere of Stable Equilibrium.*

Collecting these results furnishes the following propositions, namely:

1. Every atom of matter is surrounded by three hollow and concentric spheres of force.

2. Counting from the center, the first force is invariably repellent; the third, attractive; the second, a stable equilibrium of the other two.

It is now established in the scientific world, that heat is a mode of molecular or atomic motion. As atoms require more space when in motion than when at rest, heat expands bodies. A certain amount of expansion by heat converts a solid into a *liquid*. The atoms of a liquid are therefore further apart than they were in the solid, from which it was derived. There are no exceptions to this statement. Even ice, free from cells, or with the cells filled with water, sinks in water of its own temperature. Every fact warrants the conclusion that the atoms of liquids are retained in their places by forces which act *outside* of those already developed.

To ascertain what new forces, if any, acted in liquids, a set

of experiments was made upon their compressibility. Without detailing these experiments, it will be sufficient to state the principal results generalized.

1. All liquids are diminished in bulk by pressure.

2. Different liquids are compressed with different degrees of difficulty.

3. As the pressure is removed, they all recover their original bulk.

Reasoning upon these facts as in the case of solids, it follows that every atom of matter is surrounded by a *second Sphere* of *Repellent Force*, concentric with the first.

The common experiments with adhesion plates proved that the atoms of a liquid resisted, very perceptibly, any attempt to draw them further apart than they were. Reasoning from these experiments as before, the deduction is inevitable that, outside of the *second* sphere of repellent force, there must be a *second* and concentric sphere of attractive force. The diagram shows the relations and action of all the forces now deduced.

In this diagram, the arrows pointing away from the

atoms A and B represent the repellent forces; those pointing toward the atoms represent the attractive forces. The breaks and spaces represent the forces in equilibrium. Where the action of the forces on opposite sides of a position of equilibrium is *toward* that position, their tendency must be to restore the balance, if disturbed, and the equilibrium must be *stable;* as at *se* and *se*. As the atoms are now situated, their second spheres of forces in stable equilibrium coincide, and all the forces tend to preserve the atoms at this distance apart. They will then rest in this position. There is, therefore, between the second repellent and second attractive spheres a *second Sphere of Forces in Stable Equilibrium.*

Also, between the *first* attractive and *second* repellent forces there is a position, *ue*, where these forces must balance. But the forces at each side of this position tend to draw the atoms *away* from this position. The equilibrium, therefore, must be *unstable*, and the atoms cannot rest in that position.

These deductions correspond exactly with the facts. Atoms

are at rest in solid bodies, and also in liquids; but there is no resting place for them between the solid and the liquid state. Therefore, between the *first attractive* and *second repellent* forces there is a sphere of forces in *Unstable Equilibrium.*

If heat be applied to a liquid it is expanded—that is, its atoms are forced further apart. As the heat is increased the liquid is expanded more and more, until the atoms are separated beyond the limits of the action of the second sphere of attractive force; when they instantly are violently thrust apart, several hundred times as far as they were before, and the *liquid* becomes a *gas.* Experiments on gases show the following facts:

1. They may be diminished in bulk by pressure.

2. Increased pressure produces increased diminution, until, in some cases, the gas becomes a liquid again.

3. As the pressure is removed, the gas recovers its original bulk.

4. If *all* pressure be removed the gas continues to expand, as far as experiments have been made. Here we find evidence of a *third* sphere of repellent force.

Reasoning here as in the case of the transition of matter from the solid to the liquid state, there must be a position of equilibrium between the *second attractive* and *third repellent* forces; but, as the forces act *away from* the position of equilibrium, the equilibrium must be *unstable* and the atoms cannot rest at this distance apart. Thus, experiment demonstrates the existence of two other concentric spheres of force, namely, A *second* sphere of forces in *Unstable Equilibrium*, and a *third Sphere* of *Repellent Force.*

Great as has been the relative separation of the atoms in passing through the changes described, they are still separated by only inappreciable distances. All the spheres of forces already described act within a containing sphere so small as to be invisible, even by the aid of the most powerful miscroscope. But all experimenters concur in the fact that, at *sensible* distances apart, all atoms *attract* each other. Hence there must be, between the third repellent and third attractive spheres, a third sphere of *equilibrium.* This is shown in the figure. The heavy lines indicate repellent forces. As the third repellent and attractive forces of both atoms operate *toward* this

third position of equilibrium it must be *stable*, and the atoms can rest in this position.



Matter, with its atoms sustaining this relation to each other, has never been experimented upon; but there is a satisfactory evidence of its existence as an exceedingly attenuated interstellar medium. It is this medium which transmits light and other forces from the sun and stars. But the phenomena of light demand, for their existence, that the contiguous atoms of the transmitting medium be *nearer together than any sensible distance.* Therefore this interstellar medium is an instance of matter whose atoms are separated by their *third* spheres of forces in *stable equilibrium.*

Collecting now the results from the beginning, we have:

1. Every atom of matter is endowed with a Force nature.

2. The force is in four conditions: Repulsion, Attraction, Stable, and Unstable Equilibrium.

3. The forces act through spaces which may be represented by hollow concentric spheres or spheroids.

4. These forces are grouped in three sets, of three forces in each set, arranged invariably in the following order from the center: Repellent, Stable Equilibrium, and Attractive.

5. The middle set is separated from each of the others by a sphere of forces in unstable equilibrium.

In addition to these eleven spheres of force there may be others, binding the bodies of the universe together in groups separated by other spheres of balanced forces, in such a manner as to render impossible any "crash of worlds" of greater magnitude than that of the bodies of the same planetary system. The probability, or even the necessity, for such balancing of forces will not be discussed in this paper.

Scientific men consider it "difficult to correlate force with matter." Is it not justifiable to go a step further and consider it *impossible?* Can there be any impropriety in saying that every atom of matter has an *immaterial* nature? This nature cannot be a resultant, but is rather an endowment of matter, if it be not matter itself, as is much more probable. It is not enough to say that this immaterial nature is *force.* It is

rather a *definitely organized system of forces having reference to definite ends.*

The preceding experiments and deductions furnish at once the following definitions:

1. When the atoms of a body are separated by their *first* spheres of forces in stable equilibrium, the body is a *solid.*

2. When the atoms of a body are separated by their *second* spheres of forces in stable equilibrium, the body is a *liquid.*

3. When the atoms of a body are separated by their *third* spheres of forces in stable equilibrium, the body is an *etheroid.* (Interstellar matter.)

4. When the atoms of a body are separated by their *third* spheres of *repellent* force, the body is a gas. It is only external pressure which prevents a gas from becoming an etheroid.

The following diagram presents a linear segment of the eleven spheres of force, in their relative positions. The arrows denote the directions of the action; the spaces between their points denote the positions of stable equilibrium; the other spaces denote the positions of unstable equilibrium.

Since a liquid occupies only a little more space than the solid from which it was derived; a gas, many hundred times the space of the liquid from which it was derived; an etheroid, many million times the space of the gas from which it was derived, it follows that the thickness of the force-shells rapidly increases outward. While the whole space occupied by ten of the concentric spheres is inappreciable to the senses, the eleventh extends beyond the limits of our solar system.

Let it be remembered that not one of the preceding propositions is merely theoretical. Every one of them is the general statement of a fact, proved by direct experiment. A few additional facts, which all experiments concur in establishing, will now be given:

1. The spheres of force are mutually interpenetrable.

2. *All* these forces surround every atom, at all times and under all circumstances.

3. In the same kind of atoms they are identical in every particular.

4. In atoms of different kinds they differ in one or more of the following particulars: The *thickness* of the force-shell; the *amount* of the force; the *tension* of the force; the *distribution* of the force.

The amount and distribution of the force may be illustrated by the diagrams below, where the width of the figure represents the amount of the force, and the form represents the distribution.

1. The apex represents the position nearest that of equilibrium. In these illustrations the increase is *uniform*, but much more rapid in A than in B. They differ in *quantity* only.

2. In this case the force increases *slowly at first*, then *more rapidly*.

3. Here the increase is *rapid at first*, then more slowly.

The three cases differ from each other in the *distribution* of the force.

An effort may now be made to ascertain whether the results obtained can contribute any thing toward answering the question, What causes the properties of matter? A few examples, showing how the spheres of force must produce the properties which matter actually exhibits, will be sufficient to show the manner of applying what has been done to the solution of the question. The application is chiefly to solids.

1. If the shell of repellent force be thin, there will evidently be more atoms in a given space, and the body must be *dense*.

2. If the force increase "rapidly at first" it will be difficult to press the atoms nearer together, and the body must be *hard*.

3. If both the attractive and repellent forces be strong and increase "rapidly at first," the body will *strongly* resist tension and pressure, and must be hard and *strong*.

4. If, in addition to the last, the shell of equilibrium be thin, the atoms can be moved only a short distance with regard to each other without being torn asunder, and the body must be also *brittle*.

5. If the shell of equilibrium be thick, the rest as in the last

case, it is evident that the atoms may have considerable motion with regard to one another without parting, and the body must be not only dense, hard, and strong, but also *malleable*, *flexible*, and *inelastic*.

6. If both the repellent and attractive forces increase "slowly at first," the atoms may be pressed nearer together or drawn further apart easily, and the body must be *elastic* to both traction and pressure.

7. If the attractive force be weak and its shell thin, the atoms will be easily driven beyond the distance of unstable equilibrium, and the solid must be easily *fusible*.

8. If the attractive force be weak and its shell thick, the atoms must separate further before escaping from it, and the body will, before melting, greatly *expand* and *soften*.

9. If the *tension* of all the forces be such as to harmonize their vibrations easily with those required to produce white light, such vibrations will be easily transmitted through the body, and it must be *transparent* and *colorless*.

10. If the force vibrations can harmonize easily only with those required to produce one color, as red, blue, etc., such vibrations only will be transmitted, and the body must be transparent and *colored*.

11. If the outer forces of the atoms have a tension which harmonizes with the vibrations which cause only one color, and the inner ones, owing to their action upon one another, can harmonize only with another color, the one set of vibrations must be reflected and only the other set transmitted; and the body must therefore be transparent, but will be of the one color by reflected light, and of the other by transmitted light.

12. If the outer forces can harmonize with all light vibrations, and the inner ones, owing to their mutual interferences, with none, the body must be *opaque* and *white*.

13. If the outer forces can harmonize with only some of the light vibrations, and the inner ones with none, the body evidently must be opaque but *colored*.

14. If none of the forces can harmonize with any light vibrations, the body must be *black*.

15. If the sphere of stable equilibrium of one kind of atom can be forced, with its atom, inside of the corresponding sphere

of another kind of atom, so as to touch externally and internally, the atoms will *combine chemically*. The figure will make the meaning plain.

Let H and O, in *Fig.* 1, be respectively atoms of hydrogen and oxygen, with their corresponding spheres of stable equilibrium indicated by the circles.



Fig. 1. *Fig.* 2.

The sphere of equilibrium of an atom of hydrogen actually occupies just double the space of that of the atom of oxygen. If the oxygen sphere, with its atom, be forced inside of the hydrogen sphere, as in *Fig.* 2, the spheres will touch internally and externally, and the atoms will be combined chemically. If this be the nature of chemical combination, it is plain that the compound can occupy no more space than the hydrogen occupied before combination. This accords exactly with the facts. The force required to produce the combination accounts for the increase of temperature, and the action of two sets of forces in the space occupied by one set accounts for the change of properties.

It is with no small regret that an application of the principles advocated to some more complicated and apparently incompatible cases of chemical combination, must be withheld. To present such would require a discussion on the *origin* and *nature* of what are called elementary bodies much too long for this article. It may suffice to say that, although there are many difficulties to be overcome, many applications yet to be made, in *every case* which has been consistently worked out, the immaterial nature of matter has fully accounted for every property and every inorganic change.

The examples given are only a few of hundreds carried to an equally successful issue. Is it still premature to say that the *nature of matter is correctly expressed in terms of force*, and that every property of inorganic matter is *caused* by the action of its immaterial nature? Matter, distinct from these forces, indeed has never to be invoked.

Consider, now, a few propositions universally accepted by science:

1. The properties of matter are unchangeable.
2. No finite power or wisdom can destroy any property.

3. No finite power or wisdom can create a new one.

If these be true, it follows that the power which determined the higher nature of matter is greater than matter, greater than man, greater than both combined.

Various combinations of elements are continually being formed and destroyed, innumerable changes in the grouping and arranging of atoms are always occurring, both spontaneously and under the guidance of man. During the progress of these operations there are often exhibited results both new and unexpected. But all the skill and knowledge of modern chemists, with all their wonderful appliances, have never made the slightest approach toward developing a property or phenomenon which cannot be fully accounted for by the action of the immaterial nature of matter set forth in this article. The whole routine of inorganic operations and phenomena appears to be bound by an almighty hand within the limits of the spheres of force. Attraction, repulsion, and equilibrium comprehend and explain them all.

Within these limits the doctrines of the correlation and conservation of forces apply perfectly; beyond these limits they have never been able to go, except by mere assertion. All knowledge and all experience contradict such assertion. Scientists who believe that the phenomena of life are only modifications of chemical and other inorganic forces, do so in the face of their own confession that neither nature nor science has been able to produce a single fact or a particle of other evidence to sustain such belief. Is it worthy of the dignity of science to ask people to believe without evidence? Has the wildest religious fanaticism ever made more humiliating drafts upon the credulity and prejudices of its votaries than this *scientific fanaticism?*

There is now room for only a few general statements and remarks concerning the relations of material and organic forces.

1. All the kinds of matter found in the composition of organic bodies are found also in an inorganic state. There is no such thing as an exclusively organic kind of matter.

2. The matter composing organic bodies retains, unchanged, all its inorganic forces and properties.

3. All the functions of plants and animals are performed exclusively through the agency of these material forces.

4. It is impossible for any organic being, including man, to produce any effect whatever upon matter, except through the agency of material forces.

5. Organic bodies employ the material forces in producing and maintaining organs having definite relations to the accomplishment of remote ends.

6. All the functions, however various, are performed in complete harmony toward the accomplishment of these remote ends.

7. As soon as the organic forces cease to operate in the being, the material forces spontaneously begin to pull down the fabric which they had just before been so diligently employed in building.

8. There must be, therefore, in organic beings a nature higher than the material nature, and capable of controlling and directing the forces of the latter, toward the performing of work which otherwise they cannot do.

9. This higher nature must be of such a kind as to be able to perform, through the material forces of the body, the functions of irritability, assimilation, organization, and reproduction.

10. Material forces alone have never, under any circumstances, exhibited the slightest tendencies toward effecting such results..

11. Concretionary and crystalogenic forces may to some extent imitate organic forms, but they never imitate organic functions.

The trees and shrubs of crystalline landscapes did not grow by nutrition, or bear seed by which they could be reproduced. They did not *live;* and, when they dissolved, they did not *die.*

To illustrate what forces of organic beings can and what cannot be correlated with inorganic forces, examine the works of man. He is the most exalted being on earth. He has covered both land and water with the results of his labors and skill. He has subjected many of the forces of matter to his hand. But consider attentively any of his works—the locomotive, that thunders along its iron path; the steamer, that "walks the ocean with its feet of fire;" the telegraph, which weaves the web of human interests with its myriad lightning fingers; the power-press, which floods the world with light and knowledge—consider how these agencies originated and what

forces are concerned in their operations. Every part was formed by material forces alone, and in all they do there is not exhibited the smallest trace of the action of any but *inorganic* forces. Mind, with all its superiority over matter, cannot move an atom but by the agency of matter. All these operations are due to material forces, and can be correlated with them. Does it follow, therefore, that a higher nature did not plan the buildings and machinery, select the most fitting material for each part, arrange the forces employed in the construction, and supervise and direct these material energies to the accomplishment of the ends to which they alone are so utterly incompetent? Does the fact that only material forces are concerned in their operations prove that no higher nature superintends and guides their action?

Not distinguishing between the force which works and the force which supervises and directs the work, between the artisan and the tool, may lead to serious errors. It is not surely presumptuous for any one to say, that the great equations of organic being cannot be correctly solved, without having represented in them the more important conditions of such being.

Finally, let it be considered whether, if the nature of matter be admitted to be such as has been set forth in this paper, the correlation of organic with inorganic forces be not *impossible.*

Art. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Church Review, July, 1873. (The Church Press, Hartford, Conn.)—1. The Alt-Catholic Movement. 2. The Law of Divorce, etc. 3. Reason, and the Doctrine of the Trinity. 4. Presbyterianism and Episcopacy in Scotland. 5. Philosophy of the Eucharist. 6. Evolution: Its Place in Philosophy. 7. Superficial Education. 8. Genius of Judaism.

Bibliotheca Sacra, and Theological Eclectic, July, 1873. (Andover.)—1. Calvin and Calvinism. 2. The Meaning of נְשָׁא. 3. The Nation. 4. Paul's Panegyric of Love.—A New Critical Text, Translation, and Digest. 5. On the Authorship of Isaiah XL.-LXVI. 6. The Structure of a Sermon.—The Text. 7. John Reuchlin, the Father of Hebrew Learning in the Christian Church.

Mercersburg Review, July, 1873. (Philadelphia.)—1. Christian Worship. 2. Faith—Normal and Abnormal. 3. The Christian Church. 4. The Fall and its Import. 5 The Sunday-School in its Relation to the Church. 6. The Lessons of the Church Year not a Perversion of Holy Scripture. 7. The Study of Method in Modern Church History. 8. The Starry Heavens.

New Englander, July, 1873. (New Haven.)—1. Joel Barlow. 2. Iowa College. 3. Colleges and State Universities. 4. Herbert Spencer's Principles of Psychology. 5. Popular Songs among the Dravidian Nations. 6. Treaty of Washington in 1871. Part III. 7. A Chapter of Reminiscences: Moses Stuart. 8. Mr. Morley's "Voltaire" and "Rousseau."

New England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal, July, 1873. (Boston.)—1. Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, D.D. 2. United States Navy and Naval Academy Registers. 3. English Wills. 4. Notes on the Belcher Family. 5. Letters of Dr. Franklin, Mrs. Jane Mecom, Josiah Flagg, Richard Bache, etc. 6. Dr. Franklin's Junto, Rules of. 7. The Burning of Falmouth, (now Portland,) Maine, by a British Squadron in 1775. 8. The Shapleigh, Stileman, Martyn, Cutts, Trueworthy, and Jose Families of New Hampshire and Maine. 9. Record Book of the First Church in Charlestown, continued. 10. Journal of Captain Eleazar Melvin's Company, Shirley's Expedition, 1754; Letter from John Barber in Shirley's Expedition of 1755; and Muster-Roll of Captain Paul Brigham's Company, 1775–77. 11. Russell–Phillips. 12. The Marston Family of Salem, Mass. 13. The Dunster and Wade Families.

North American Review, July, 1873. (Boston.)—1. Modern Medicine. 2. Arthur Schopenhauer and his Pessimistic Philosophy. 3. The Proposed Changes in the Telegraphic System. 4. Fires and Fire Departments. 5. Sibley's Graduates of Harvard University. 6. The Session.

Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review, July, 1873. (New York.)—1. The General Synod of Protestants in France. 2. The Sunday-School, its Past and Present. 3. Life and Its Instincts. 4. Faith as an Ambiguous Middle Term. 5. One Hundred Protestant Theses. 6. Sources of Divine Knowledge. 7. Letter to the Editors from Rev. J. B. Adger, D.D. 8. Notes on Current Topics. 9. Dr. Nott on the Resurrection. 10. American Authorship.

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, July, 1873. (Gettysburg.)—1. Some Assumptions against Christianity. 2. The Religion of our Civil Government. 3. Angelology. 4. On the Proper Limits of Creeds. 5. The Salvability of the Heathen. 6. The Retreat of Science on the Antiquity of the Human Race. 7. Knowledge by Service.

Theological Medium, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, July, 1873. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Ecclesiology. 2. Missions. 3. Unwilling Testimony. 4. "The Divine Purpose" Examined. 5. The Soul. 6. Close Communion. 7. The Religious Character of Faraday. 8. The Land of the Veda.

Universalist Quarterly, July, 1873. (Boston.)—1. Contributions to the History of Universalism.—Franciscus Puccius. 2. Science and Divinity. 3. Scriptural Usage of the Phrase Holy Ghost. 4. Biblical Interpretation from the Apostolic Age to the Time of Origen. 5. John Wesley and his Opinions. 6. The Failure of Buddhism. 7. The Assassins.

Christian Quarterly, July, 1873. (Cincinnati.)—1. Our Representative Religions. 2. The Liberal Education of Girls. 3. The Relation of the Church to Crime. 4. Church Polity. 5. Fénélon and Religious Toleration. 6. Ecclesiastical Polity in the First Age.

The first article of the "Christian Quarterly" is decidedly, racy and suggestive. The representative religions are reckoned to be four: Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Unitarians. These exhibit four typical characters, and the other denominations simply divide the typical traits of these four. Accuracy in detail is often sacrificed to point; but the whole is a tolerably fair characterization, and calculated to awaken thought. The writer is probably a Unitarian. We

give extended passages, especially those touching our own Church.

"The Methodists are characterized by good sense, the Episcopalians by good taste, the Presbyterians by good learning, and the Unitarians by good thought. The Methodist can be said to be the people's Church, the Episcopalian the fashionable Church, the Presbyterian the scholars' Church, and the Unitarian the thinkers' Church."—P. 289.

"The most prominent feature of the Methodists is their practicalness. They always adopt appropriate and adequate means to proposed ends, and do it with the same business-like tact and energy which characterize men in secular affairs. They never make it a question of how the ancients did things, or even of how the apostles or Christ did them; but they would rather borrow a useful thing any day from the world than a useless one from the Church. They have, accordingly, broken off from all ecclesiastical ways and airs, and support no useless traditional machinery or forms—no fifth wheels—however hallowed by time or usage. On the other hand, they make use of all modern inventions and devices to carry on their work: the press, with its gigantic book concerns and countless periodicals; the American educational system, with its colleges and seminaries in almost every town; corporations and stock companies, to carry forward missionary and Church extension enterprises; national organizations for Christian perfection; women's societies for aiding the pastors; conventions and institutes for Sunday-school work; conference associations for life insurance and for support of the aged and orphans, etc. Their whole Church economy, in fact, is of modern invention, and far more effective than any thing of ecclesiastical traditions: as their itinerancy, by which they supply every place in the country with a preacher, and every body who wants to preach with a place; their local preachers' system, by which they get men of all professions to preach occasionally who can not be induced to preach exclusively, and to preach for nothing when they have no money to pay them; their system of exhorters, by which they get men who will not preach at all to take charge of meetings, and to exhort, which is only another name for more effective preaching; their class-meetings, by which they get others still at work, both as

preachers and as pastors, and get all the Church-members to speak more or less on religion; their prayer-meetings, where every body is expected to pray, and, if need be, to exhort or preach; their special revival services, where personal effort is required even of the sinner, and where every one charged with passion can fire off. In short, the Methodist idea is to press every body into the active service, the women as well as the men; for the women take part in all these meetings, speaking in class-meeting, praying in prayer-meeting, and often preaching from the pulpit."—Pp. 289, 290.

"Again: the Methodist is pre-emimently a present Church. Its work and interests are all now. Methodists have no concern whether their Church is the same as the ancient Church, or whether it is derived from it, or whether its ministers have succeeded to the apostles. They don't trouble themselves, as do the Episcopalians, about defending the ancient Church or ancient Christians, but let them stand or fall on their own merits. Their Church, moreover, changes every four years, when it is cut off anew from the past. At the Tyng trial, an Episcopalian minister asked a Methodist for his Book of Discipline. When the latest edition—that of 1864—was given him, he inquired, 'Where are your previous authorities?' The Methodist answered, 'All of Methodism is in 1864.'* The Methodist Church is as different from what it was in the days of Wesley as from what it will be in the twentieth century; so that it is amusing to see Episcopalians try to convert Methodists by proving that Wesley was an Episcopalian, or Congregationalists arguing against their episcopacy because Welsey did not approve of it. The Methodists do not care any more for Wesley's opinion than for St. Dominic's or St. Paul's on such subjects.† In their preaching, too, the Methodists are modern, even to the latest telegraphic quotations. They often preach on the newest sensation, or on Huxley's or Renan's theory, instead of dwelling on Simon Peter's wife's mother or the sycamore-tree up which Zaccheus climbed. They discourse

* It was not an intelligent Methodist who gave this answer. We have our "History of the Discipline," exhibiting every change from the foundation of our Church. We have Journals of our General Conferences back to our first General Conference. We have the best denominational history in the English language, from the pen of Stevens. No Church more strictly preserves its historical connections.

† A very great mistake.

on General Grant's last message rather than on the decree of Nebuchadnezzar. They talk about the United States rather than about Judea: about petroleum rather than frankincense. They attack the sins of New York, and of 1873, rather than of Jerusalem and of antediluvian times. And they do this though it is breaking off from all Church precedent and ecclesiastical propriety. In all things they change with the time, and give themselves entirely up to the present, throwing themselves into the live questions which constitute the spirit of the age. The Methodist preacher believes in making himself one of the people among whom he lives, on the ground that a man in another age cannot successfully preach to this.

"In the next place, the Methodists are a political Church. Their passionate, practical, and secular nature impels them to this. In our present politics they are Republicans, and at all times they are ranged on the more progressive side. There is nothing conservative about them. During the war they were Union men, the few copperheads among them generally seceding, or getting put out for disloyalty. In the Union Church, of St. Louis, the pastor used to require all applicants for membership to take the oath of allegiance. The Methodist Church, far more than any other, suffered by losses and splits during the war; for a Methodist always thinks far more of his country than of his Church. *In the South this same characteristic showed itself, where the Methodists espoused the cause of their section, and were the first, most unanimous, and most rabid in the Rebellion.* The Methodists fought over slavery long before any other Church thought of it, and had split the Church in two twenty years before the politicians tried to split the nation on the same issue.

"Another peculiarity of the Methodists is, that they are not strongly attached to the Church. They stick in it loosely, and give it but little of their thought. They always think more of the objects they are after, whether political or religious, than of the Church. *They have no great power to keep their converts; but more are lost to them every year than would fill all the other churches.* They do not instruct them in Methodist doctrines, but give them over to the world as soon as converted. They have no high idea of a Church in any sense, and do not think that uniting with the Church amounts to any thing mor-

ally, or that uniting with the Methodist Church is better than uniting with any other. They rarely proselyte, and would about as soon that people were good outside of Church as in it. They open their doors wide enough for any body, however young or ignorant or unorthodox, to enter, and they leave them open for any body to go out. They take every body into Church with the understanding that it is only for six months, (!) and that he can go out any time during the trial period without notice. As showing how little they care for their Church organization, they are divided into no less than eleven sects, which have broken off on the slightest provocations, and remain on good terms, none of them caring for a reunion. There are also many independent Methodist Churches, and preachers belonging to no organization whatever. A Methodist preacher often leaves his own denomination for another, sometimes temporarily, and sometimes permanently, not because of any change of opinion, but because he thinks there is no difference in which Church he works.*

"Again: the Methodist Church is a Church of reforms: not so much of reforms in favor of distant ideals as of reforms against prevailing evils and sins, such as slavery, intemperance, theater-going, dancing, tobacco-chewing, etc.; reforms that are immediate and personal—herein differing from the Unitarians, who purpose great schemes for humanity to solve, without any appliances to bring them home to individuals. They push these reforms with a zeal that endangers the Church itself. We have already seen how they have acted in regard to slavery and politics generally. A whole conference will sometimes declare itself so strongly against dancing, card-playing, and other amusements, as to frighten away nearly all the young people. The Minnesota Conference recently refused to admit any body to its membership who uses tobacco, caring more for reform in tobacco than for prosperity in the Church. The late General Conference declared all members dealing in liquor, whether as distillers, bar-keepers, or drinkers, to be

*There is truth enough in this paragraph to point us to our weak spot. The wisdom of our Church needs to be concentrated upon the question, How shall we not only convert souls but retain them? Dr. Foster years ago said, "We are a splendid army of aggression, but a defective army of occupation." This refers not so much to the retention of posts, for where we put down we are very sure to stay put, but to individuals and to floating numbers.

subject to disciplinary action. Very often a conference resolves, *en masse*, to oppose all political candidates who drink, or favor license laws. A church often turns out its wealthiest members for occasional drinking or dancing; not because they are unfit for the Church, but because they exert a bad influence. The Methodists mean to break down these evils whether it break the Church or not. In short, they think more about the ends they have to accomplish than about the Church, which is a means to accomplish them.* Herein they are the opposites of the Episcopalians, who hold Church first, and morals and salvation afterward.

"On the whole, the Methodist Church will be seen to be a great organization, moving on the world for definite and powerful results, striking where there is most to be done, and not caring whether nerves or Churches or nations are shattered; or whether it may not itself be lost in the magnitude of its own results. The Methodist Church is often called the great drag-net, which sweeps through all waters and gathers every thing into its folds. But, while it is a big net, it has big meshes; so that while it catches every thing, it leaves immense quantities of small-fry. The Methodist Church converts for all the other Churches; for, of the products of an ordinary Methodist revival, some go to the Presbyterian, some to the Baptist, and some to the Episcopalian and other Churches.† And of those who unite with the Methodist

* We are glad to record this testimony to our persistent readiness to rebuke and make aggression upon sin, which some have at the present day questioned. As destroying sin and spreading holiness are the very objects for which a Church exists, so to purchase safety for the Church by sacrificing these objects, is to secure the existence of the Church by forfeiting her right to exist.

† A truth both annoying and consoling. We have more than once said to a Presbyterian who viewed Methodists as a superfluous sect: "My dear sir, so far from our detracting from your strength, you are all the stronger for our existence. We not only back up all evangelical Christianity with our strength, but we are continually gathering in raw material from the world, converting it, and distributing it among other denominations." The consolation of it is that essential Methodism is becoming infused into the entire evangelical Church.

And this reminds us of two prophecies, one of which was fulfilled and the other not, as follow:

One of the holiest men American Methodism ever produced was Rev. Nathaniel Porter, first Principal of Cazenovia Seminary. We never saw him but once, and his heavenly face still lives in our memory. On his dying bed he heard some zealous friends saying that they believed that every body would yet become Meth-

Church, including all classes of temperaments, many subsequently leave it for others, because not constitutionally adapted to be Methodists. But, notwithstanding it supplies all other Churches, it still keeps itself larger than any of the rest, and increases at a faster rate."—Pp. 292–295.

"Comparing now, by way of summary, the several religions above mentioned, the Methodist Church has least learning, the Episcopalian least thought, the Presbyterian too much learning for independent thought, and the Unitarian too much independent thought for connected systems, whether of learning or of Church work. The Methodists are, accordingly, one extreme, and the Unitarians the other, of practicalness, it being all with the Methodists; and *vice versa* as to thought, this being with the Unitarians. For while the Methodists have just enough thought and learning to be active, the Unitarians and Presbyterians have great, unwieldy stores of it, which they do not use. The Methodists, who know so well how to do, have not learned how to think without doing. They are spendthrifts of their powers, using their knowledge up so close as to turn it all into practical results.

"Touching the grounds of religion, the Methodists accept Christianity *without knowing any thing about it!* the Episcopalians take it on authority, the Presbyterians on faith, and the Unitarians reject it. The Methodists, in this matter, are simply ignorant, the Episcopalians stupid, the Presbyterians prejudiced, and the Unitarians indifferent.

"With regard to the constituencies of the Churches, the Methodists can be said to embrace the people generally—the workingmen, negroes, politicians, traders, and practical men. The Episcopalian embraces the aristocracy, especially the codfish kind—the swells, fashionable folks, snobs, clerks, coquettes, fine ladies, wives of officers and public men, (when their

odists. "No," replied he, "all will not become Methodists, but all the sister denominations will become Methodized. Our life and zeal will in time quicken them all." Of that prophecy we have seen a great verification.

The first interview we ever had with Dr. Durbin was in 1832. In that conversation he remarked: "We shall not grow, as a denomination, in the future as in the past. Heretofore when any one was in earnest for salvation he was obliged to come to us for sympathy and guidance. But other denominations have now become so enlivened that inquirers no longer need to come to us." Acute as the remark was its prophecy has been signally falsified, and Dr. Durbin has had the honor to contribute largely to its non-fulfillment.

husbands are not religious,) first families of Virginia, descendants of Pocahontas, and of old English (Norman) stock. The Presbyterian is the Church of professors, especially professors of the Greek and Latin classics, and of formal logic; the Unitarian the Church of physicists, chemists, geologists, metaphysicians, discoverers, etc. The Methodists are the heart, the Episcopalians the nerves, and the Unitarians the brains, of American religion. With regard to climatic distribution, the Methodist, like the dog, is of universal latitude, the Episcopalians are suited to the South, the Presbyterians to the Middle States, and the Unitarians to the North. And, finally, touching our historical relations, the Methodist is the present Church, the Episcopalians the past Church, the Unitarians the future Church. The Methodist is according to the age, the Episcopalians live in another age—a past age—the Unitarians expatiate in the imperfectibility of the ideal future, the Presbyterians have one foot in the past and one in the present. The Methodist will always be the actual Church, the Unitarian the ideal one; although, with their genius for change, the Methodists will more likely become the Unitarian Church, than the Unitarians, with their denominational inefficiency, grow to embrace the whole." *—Pp. 304, 305.

Southern Review, July, 1873. (St. Louis.)—1. Truth *versus* Tradition. 2. Oliver Wendell Holmes. 3. The Thompson-Tyndall Prayer-Test. 4. The Land of the Veda. 5. The Origin and Character of the Gipsies. 6. Modern Culture. 7. History of Christianity in the Southern States. 8. Folk-Lore. 9. The New Birth. 10. The Genius of George Eliot.

We record with great pleasure the fact that the present number of the "Southern Review" contains not a single polit-

*There is quite as much probability of our becoming Papists. The writer has no idea of our unchanging firmness of doctrine. He does not know that in England the Methodists hold themselves to be the most immovable stay of English orthodoxy. Now, as at the beginning, we hold fast to the theology of John Wesley, and could accurately express it on every point in John Wesley's own words. And this not by applying any staying force upon ourselves, but by a spontaneous and loving preference for the mild evangelicism of the Wesleyan-Arminian system. And if there is any thing in which Methodism exults, and glories, and shouts aloud with her loftiest voice, it is in proclaiming to the world the joyous message of a full, free, abounding, and unlimited redemption through the priceless atonement of the eternal son of God. She runs with the feet of the roe, and flies with the wings of the eagle, to fill the world with that wonderful news. This is her joy and her life, and when this ceases she shall give up the ghost. She is then but a stupendous bubble, and the sooner she bursts and goes out the better

ical article. We do not sanguinely infer from this that it has renounced its double character as a politico-ecclesiastical periodical "under the auspices of the M. E. Church, South." Far less do we infer any renunciation by the Church, South of her politico-ecclesiastical position. Dr. Bledsoe, as we have formerly stated, was Secretary of War under Jefferson Davis; and the full unison of the extracts we have given in our Quarterly from his Review, with the celebrated speech of Davis lately delivered at the Sulphur Springs, fully evince that treason in the South is assuming permanent form and biding its time. We suppose there is a measure of truth in the extreme statement of the ex-President, that he never yet saw a reconstructed woman. And thus the true hiding-place of Southern treason is under the feminine petticoat and the clerical gown. And it is a truly painful thought that its most unequivocal hiding-place is "under the auspices of the M. E. Church, South." Her bishops, her press, her ministry, are the propaganda of ultra-Calhounism. For this, among many now existing reasons, we profoundly regret any offer of fraternal recognition, on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to the Church South. And knowing, as we do, that a political bias underlies all the repugnance of the Church South to reunion, we have a strong presentiment that no real fraternization will, for the present generation, take place.

If we rightly construe the antecedents of the General Conference of the Church South, it is pledged to reject all fraternity with us on any other basis than what they call "The Plan of Separation." This mythical "plan" requires our Church to withdraw entirely from the Southern States, and leave the entire area to said Church South. This was declared by their delegate, Dr. Pierce, in 1848, to be their only basis; his declaration was reaffirmed by their Bishops in their response to our Bishops at St. Louis; and their last General Conference reaffirmed both declarations in response to Janes and Harris. This condition has been elaborately maintained by some writers in the Southern papers. We doubt not, however, that the proposal by the Southern General Conference of any conditions whatever will settle the matter promptly in the negative. Our delegates will doubtless forthwith withdraw, and our Church would then wait, with perfect tranquillity, for

Southerndom to make the next proposition. The whole aspect of the case suggests that we press our own missionary operations over the whole South, carefully regardful of others' rights, yet boldly maintaining our own principles, respectfully independent as to what the Churches South are pleased to think, or say, or do.

English Reviews.

London Quarterly Review, July, 1873. (London.)—1. The People's Highways as a State Monopoly. 2. Works of George Cruiksbank. 3. Eastern Equatorial Africa. 4. The Agricultural Laborers' Union. 5. Ulphilas and the Gothic Scriptures. 6. Methodism and Higher Education. 7. Doctrine and Dogma. 8. Michaud on the Papacy.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, July, 1873. (London.)—1. Richard Hooker. 2. The Reconstruction of the Church of Scotland, and Re-Union of the Presbyterian Churches on the Reformation and Revolution Basis of 1560 and 1690. 3. Wickliff and his Times. 4. The Philosophy of the Unconditioned. 5. The Letters of Saint Augustine. 6. Presbyterianism in British North America. 7. The Relation of God to Man in Creation and Redemption. Reprinted Articles: 1. Tulloch's Rational Theology. 2. The Chronological Value of the Genealogy in Genesis. 3. The late Dr. Burns.

German Reviews.

Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. (Journal for Scientific Theology, edited by Professor Hilgenfeld. 1873. Third Number.) 1. Hilgenfeld, The Old and the New Creed, a Review of the Books of Dr. F. Strauss and Lagarde. 2. Pfleiderer, Remarks on Conscience, with Special Regard to the Work of Gass, "Die Lehre von Gewissen," (The Doctrine of Conscience.) 3. M. Grimm, Commentary to 1 Cor. xv, 20, 28. 4. Siegfried, Philo, and the Text of the Septuagiuta. 5. Holtzmann, The Epistle to Philemon, Critically Examined. 6. Krenkel, Josephus and Lucas.

The new work of Dr. F. Strauss, on "The Old and the New Creed," continues to be discussed in the theological and literary periodicals of Germany. Professor Hilgenfeld, in the first article of the above number of the Journal for Scientific Theology, reviews the work from the stand-point of the critical school of Germany, which agrees with Strauss in rejecting the authenticity of most of the books of the New Testament, but entirely disagrees from the conclusion which Strauss draws, that those who reject the orthodox view of the origin of Christianity should cease to regard themselves and call themselves Christians. The second book reviewed by Hilgenfeld is by Paul de Lagarde, and is entitled "Ueber das Verhältniss des Deutschen States zu Theologie, Kirche, and Religion." (On the relation of the German State to Theology, Church, and Religion,

1873.) The author is Professor of Oriental languages at the University of Gottingen, and is known in the literary world chiefly as the learned and very accurate editor of ancient Oriental translations of the Bible, of ancient Church writers, and of treatises on the text of the Bible. He now, for the first time, takes part in the theological controversies of the age, by a book which has attracted particular attention on account of the peculiar views of the author. Lagarde believes that Christianity, Catholicism, and Protestantism, have wholly lost their vitality, but he distinguishes between Christianity and the everlasting Gospel of Jesus, which he hopes will be restored in its original purity. Christianity, as it appears in history, he regards as a disfigured Gospel, the fault of which he chiefly attributes to Paul, who in his opinion wholly misunderstood the plain teaching of Jesus, which centered in the idea of the kingdom of God. He charges him in particular with having introduced the theological views of the Old Testament into the Christian Church, and that by this Old Testament theology the Gospel of Jesus has been stifled as far as this was possible. In a second work he will undertake to prove that Jesus never thought of representing himself as the Messiah of the Jews. The teaching of Jesus Lagarde regards as the greatest among all religions, beyond which no progress is possible.

French Reviews.

Revue Chretienne, (Christian Review,) *May*, 1873.—1. Pressense, Three Discourses on the Unity of the Church, (Second Article.) 2. Lichtenberger, The Confessions of Dr. Strauss. 3. Bois, The Lyrical Poetry of the Hebrews, (Second Article.)

June.—1. Pressense, Three Discourses on the Unity of the Church, (Third Article.) 2. Schoen, The School and the Lyceum. 3. Lucas, A Wish of Christian Civilization. 4. Doumergne, German Lutheran Liturgy.

July.—1. Sabatier, Paul of Tarsus, the Apostle of the Pagans. 2. Cadene, a Scholar's Youth, Journal and Correspondence of A. M. Aufere. 3. The Obstacles to a Catholic Reform, Discourse held at the Old Catholic Congress by Dr. (now Bishop) Reinkens. 4. Lichtenberger, The Revival of the Church. 5. Doumergne, Religious Germany.

The May and June numbers of the Revue Chretienne complete the brilliant series of discourses on the unity of the Christian Church, to which we have already called attention in the July number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*. The greatest and most formidable obstacle to the true unity of the

Church, Pressensé finds in the false Catholicity which has in the course of centuries been developed in the Church of Rome, and has now been completed by the dogmatization of papal infallibility. With this Church, as long as it stands on its present basis, no understanding is possible. Among Protestants he designates in particular the union of Church and State, in consequence of which the Churches are used as tools for carrying out or supporting the plans of the State Government, and the spirit of confessionalism which unduly magnifies the binding character of the human confessions of faith, and looks down with contempt upon the Christian character of other religious denominations as the greatest obstacles to Christian union. The third discourse takes a hopeful view of the future. Pressensé believes that the system of Romanism will now enter into the era of decline. The Catholic world could not thoroughly understand its corruptions and baneful influence until the system was complete in all its parts. This is now the case; and we have, therefore, reason to expect that now there will come the awakening, and that the great recoil of the Christian conscience from the superstitions of the papal system will ere long set in. In the Protestant world he finds that the principle of a separation between Church and State is steadily gaining ground, and that the Evangelical Alliance has already practically shown to the world that the leading Protestant Churches, while differing in minor points, agree in what is essential.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Our account of the progress of the Old Catholic Church of Germany, in the last number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review," closed with the election of Professor Hubert Reinkens as first bishop of the Church. It was a remarkable coincidence that on the same day (June 4) the head of the Old Catholic Church of Holland, Archbishop Loos of Utrecht, suddenly died. It is a matter of course that many Ultramontane papers saw herein a clear manifestation of divine wrath. The old Catholics, as Jansenists of Holland, have a hierarchy consisting of an Archbishop of Utrecht and Bishops of Harlem and Deventer, the former of whom is, however, without diocese. The title of Bishop of Harlem having been vacant for some time, the death of the Archbishop of Utrecht raised

some hope in the Ultramontanes that the bishop elect of the German Old Catholics would probably have to wait long for his consecration. Some even went so far as to circulate a report that the only surviving member of the Jansenist hierarchy, Bishop Heykamp of Deventer, had refused to consecrate Bishop Reinkens. But these hopes and dreams were soon to be disappointed. The consecration of Professor Reinkens as first Old Catholic Bishop of the German Empire is an accomplished fact. It took place on August 11 at Rotterdam, in Holland, simultaneously with the consecration of a new Bishop of Harlem. The ceremonies lasted for three hours, and are said to have attracted great attention. Deputies even went from Cologne, Bonn, Brussels, Crefeld, and many other places, and the English Church of Dusseldorf had sent its pastor as delegate.

Bishop Reinkens has long had the reputation of being one of the greatest scholars of Catholic Germany. He was born in 1821 at Burtscheid, near Aix-la-Chapelle, worked in his youth in a factory of Aix-la-Chapelle, and entered a gymnasium when he was nineteen years old. From 1844 to 1847 he studied, at the University of Bonn, philosophy, philology, and theology; was soon after ordained as a priest, and in 1850 was appointed as a lecturer (*Privatdocent*) on Church history at the University of Breslau. In 1853 he was also appointed Cathedral preacher, (*Domprediger*,) and in 1857 advanced to an ordinary professor of the University. From 1867 to 1868 he was in Rome, where he received the same impressions as did Luther three hundred years ago. When the great battle against Papal infallibility began in the Catholic Church of Germany he took at once a prominent part in it, and few have been so indefatigable. In all the successive movements which have preceded the establishment of the Church he was one of the leaders, and the best books that have been written on the subject are from his pen. His works on "Hilarius of Poitiers," on "Martin of Tours," and others, are highly valued.

As the Old Catholics retain on the whole the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, except the unconditional submission to the Pope, no systematic efforts could be made for the consolidation and extension of the Church until they had a bishop. They are now in a position to show what force there may be in their movement, and it is generally believed that no man could have been so useful a bishop to the Church as Reinkens. From what thus far has taken place, it would seem that the Church constitution of the Old Catholic Church, when fully finished, will greatly resemble that of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The third Old Catholic Congress, which in September will be held in Constance, will adopt a law regulating the constitution of the Congregations and of the Synod. The formal recognition of the Old Catholic Bishop by the Government of Prussia is shortly expected.

In the meanwhile the Government of Prussia asserts its authority against the schemes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy with great firmness. As the bishops refused to have their institutions, which are supported by the

State, examined by the State Inspectors, the Government has declared that it no longer recognizes them as State institutions. It will no longer pay any salaries to the professors, nor any subsidies for the support of the buildings; nor will it recognize any certificates of study that will be given to its pupils. If this complication continues for several years it may place the Roman Catholic bishops in a very awkward position, for if the Government does not recognize the priests educated in the Episcopal seminaries, the Roman Catholic Church may soon see herself wholly disestablished and the Old Catholic Church gradually supplant her.

GREEK CHURCH.

Since the beginning of the year 1872, there exists in the Church of Russia a religious society which bids fair to exercise a great influence, not only upon this Church itself, but also upon its relation to the other great divisions of the Christian world. The Society calls it the "Association of the Friends of Ecclesiastical Enlightening," and contains among its most active members the young theologians who have studied at the German universities, and who on that account take a special interest in the religious movements of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches. The Grand Duke Constantine, the brother of the Emperor, is the patron of the Association, and takes often an active part in its proceedings. The Society officially states its objects to be as follows: 1. To promote the intercourse between our clergy and the secular society, and the exchange of opinions on questions concerning the Orthodox Church. 2. The diffusion of correct views on the true doctrine, the history, and the present wants of the Orthodox Church, by means of books and lectures, both scientific and popular. 3. To entertain communications with the champions of orthodox truth in foreign countries, to give to them a moral support, and to contribute to the enlightenment of the public opinion of foreign countries concerning the Orthodox Church. With regard to the first and second points it is said: "One of the chief public calamities of our time is the indifference of the laity with regard to the questions and wants of Church life. In our country also society derives too little advantage from the enlightening of the Church. The clergy has assumed the organization and the habits of a caste, and the Russian Church itself is exposed to attacks upon its pretended lethargy, though this is by no means an inherent quality of orthodoxy. Our first and most important task consists, therefore, in our activity at home. According to our programme we must endeavor to awaken in the orthodox society an interest in religious questions, and as much as possible to bring the laity and the clergy nearer to each other." As regards the third question, the Secretary of the Society, Alexander Kiriyev, in his report on the year 1872–1873, remarks: "No one who watches public opinion can have failed to see the interest which Russia has taken in the great religious events of the Western countries. The intense attention with which the whole Russian society has followed these events and the religious questions of the age in general, which formerly were regarded as

the exclusive domain of the clergy, proved the advantage and the necessity of founding a society which can serve as a center for all who take an active interest in religious questions, and as a bond of union for clergy and laity, giving to both an opportunity for common action. We can no longer think of separating ourselves from the remainder of the Christain world by a Chinese wall ; for we must not forget that the community of interests among civilized nations is not on the decrease, but steadily on the increase. No, we are not indifferent to what happens in the remainder of Europe ; it is not the same to us what other Christians think of us. It is true, we have been for ten centuries without the sympathy of the West, which was arrayed against us in hostile opposition; it blamed us because it did not know us. But at present, when the most educated representatives of the Catholic Church loudly express their hopes for reconciliation between the Orthodox East and the separated West, indifference toward this cause would be a crime ; it would prove that we pray for Christian union with our lips, but not with our hearts." In the third meeting of the Society Professor Katanski delivered an interesting address on the former attempts to reunite the Greek Oriental and the Roman Catholic Churches. He distinguishes three periods in the history of these attempts. The first, from the eleventh century to the downfall of the Byzantine Empire, is the period of the official attempts, mostly proceeding from political combinations. In the second period the Popes and the Jesuits endeavored to bring about a union, as a means to draw the Greek Oriental Church over to a "pure Latinism." In the present age, for the first time, the conviction is gaining ground that the religious reunion of the Western world with the East cannot be effected by coercive measures of a political character, nor by dialectic discussions and shrewd Jesuitic schemes, but that it must be the fruit of the quiet work of religious ideas and the progress of religious life in the West. On the other hand, the speaker admits that the East also must have its revival, on the character of which he expresses the following views: "The East must previously be born again, both politically and intellectually, must emancipate itself from the external fetters which now oppress it, must raise the level of its education, produce a rich theological literature, compel the Western nations to read and respect it, and in this way enable the West to arrive at a correct understanding and appreciation of the East, which is first requisite for bringing the two parts of the Christian world nearer to each other. The regeneration of the East has begun, but it is not yet complete. The whole of the East is not yet politically free, (Turkey); and the intellectual regeneration is still far from being accomplished; therefore the East is not yet regarded by the West as its peer, nor can it regard itself as a peer; and in its oppressed condition it keeps aloof from the proud brother who feels his superiority. It has not yet reached that condition of security from abroad and vitality within which would enable it joyfully to entertain the idea of sharing with its brother the old treasure which it has kept inviolate."

THE MOHAMMEDAN WORLD.

The number of countries in which Mohammedanism is the predominant religion, or at least a great power, is still considerable. There are about six and a half millions of Mohammedans in Europe, nearly eighty millions in Asia, and almost quite as many in Africa. It is a remarkable circumstance, that by far the most powerful Mohammedan ruler of the globe, the Sultan of Turkey, resides in Europe, where the Islam has only a population of about four and a half millions in the Turkish and two millions in the Russian dominions. Even the Sultan himself has in the European division of his empire more Christian subjects than Mohammedan. In Asia Mohammedanism strongly predominates in Asiatic Turkey, which has a Mohammedan population of at least thirteen millions. Persia, with its five millions, is an almost exclusively Mohammedan country. The same is the case with Afghanistan, Beloochistan, and the Khanates of Independent Tartary. In China the Mohammedans constitute a compact body, both in the North-west and in the South-western provinces. In both places they have endeavored to establish their independence. In the North-west they have so far succeeded that the new Mohammedan empire of Yakoob Kushbegi has for several years successfully maintained its independence, and is still extending its boundaries. On the other hand, the Mohammedan rebels in the South-west, the so-called Panthay, have during the present year succumbed to the victorious Chinese armies. The death of their Sultan and the destruction of their capital, Talifu, and their other principal places, seem for the present to have put an end, not only to their rule in those regions, but even to their political influence. In the vast British Empire of India the Mohammedan population is estimated at about twenty-five millions, and predominates in a number of the native States which are British dependencies. The Mohammedans also constitute a majority of the population of the large and important island of Java, where they are rapidly increasing; and on the island of Sumatra they control, among others, the kingdom of Acheen, which has of late attracted so great attention by its conflict with the Netherlands. Russia has in its Asiatic possessions a Mohammedan population of about one million five hundred thousand. In Africa, Mohammedanism has, since the beginning of the present century, made great progress in the negro States, and has in particular become the controlling power of Central Africa, and advanced westward as far as Liberia. According to the latest estimates the Mohammedans of Africa are believed to constitute a population of about seventy-seven millions, among a total population of about one hundred and ninety-two millions. Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, Egypt, Zanzibar, are all Mohammedan States; in the South and South-west they do not anywhere predominate, although they are found every-where in increasing numbers.

Although Mohammedanism, since the beginning of the present century, has conquered a considerable territory in Central Africa, it is

every-where in a condition of steadily progressing decay. The most intelligent travelers of modern times show a remarkable agreement with regard to this point. H. von Maltzahn, who visited, in the disguise of a Mohammedan pilgrim, all the Mohammedan countries from Timbuctu to Mecca, and the Hungarian Vambery, who in the same disguise traveled from Teheran to Samarcand; Henry Barth, who penetrated into Central Africa as far as Timbuctu, and Palgrave, who in 1862 visited Central and Eastern Arabia, and in particular the Empire of the Wahabites, all bear witness to this decay of the Islam. The Baron of Maltzahn, in his book of the "Pilgrimage to Mecca," which he joined in 1860, under the name of Sidi Abd'er Rahman ben Mohammed es Skikdi, says, "The Islam has long been undermined, but now it appears to be on the eve of a general collapse; all that formerly constituted its glory—science, scholarship, art, industry—has long left it; its political power has become a laughing-stock, its commerce has been reduced to zero; one thing only seems to stay for a time the impending collapse—religious fanaticism. A remarkable instance of this decline of Mohammedanism is shown in the decrease of the population of the large cities. Thus Bagdad, which at the time of the Khalifate had two million inhabitants, has now only one hundred thousand; the population of Basra has been reduced from two hundred thousand to eighty thousand; that of Aleppo from two hundred thousand to ninety thousand; that of Samarcand from one hundred and eighty thousand to twenty thousand; that of Katsena, which in the seventeenth century was the first city of Central Soudan, from one hundred thousand to eight thousand. Even the population of the holy city of Mecca, the most licentious city of the East, has been reduced from one hundred thousand to forty-five thousand.

The only country of the Mohammedan world which, during the last twenty years, has made real and important progress, is Egypt; but its progress is clearly traceable to the influence of Christian countries. Most of the rulers of the house of Mehemet Ali have shown their appreciation of the superiority of the civilization of foreign Christian countries, and made earnest effort to elevate Egypt to a level with it. All the sons of the present Khedive have received a European education; one has been instructed in Paris, a second one in England, and a third one is to enter the Prussian army. Industrial departments have been created, as in the constitutional monarchies of Europe, and a Council of State has been created to advise the Khedive in all the important affairs of the State. The most influential among the Egyptian ministers, and for many years the chief adviser of the Khedive, is an Armenian Christian, Nubar Pasha. Even an assembly of deputies meets annually since 1866, which, as it is officially expressed, is to control the administration and to fix the budget. Sweeping reforms have, in particular, been effected in the department of public education. Since 1868 public schools have been established by the Government in all the important places of the country. They numbered in 1870 about four thousand pupils, who received from the Government not only gratuitous instruction, but their

entire support, inclusive of clothing. These schools embrace both the primary and the secondary instruction. The former embraced Arabic reading and writing, arithmetic, drawing, French, or, according to the location of the place, some other foreign languages. From the elementary school the pupils pass into the preparatory department of the secondary school. The course lasts three years, and embraces the study of the Arabic, Turkish, French, and English languages; mathematics, drawing, history, and geography. After completing this preparatory course the pupil enters one of the special schools which are to finish his education for the service of the State. These special schools are: 1. The Polytechnical School, the course of which lasts four years. As in France, its pupils are permitted to choose between the civil and the military career. In the former case the pupil enters for two years the School of Administration, and afterward the service of the State; in the latter case he enters the Military Academy of the Abbassieh at Cairo. The Polytechnical School had, in 1871, seventy-one pupils. 2. The Law School. The students study the law of the Islam, especially that of Egypt, which is now in the course of a radical transformation, and also the Roman law and the present laws of the European countries. 3. The Philological School. 4. The School of Arts and Industry, founded at Balak by Mehemet Ali, and greatly perfected by Ismail Pasha. 5. The Medical School, with which is connected a School of Midwifery, the only one which exists in the East 6. The Naval School in Alexandria. Quite recently the Egyptian Government has called the celebrated German Orientalist, H. Brugsch of Göttingen, to Cairo, in order to organize there an Academy for Archæology, and in particular Egyptological studies.

All these reforms are making wide breaches into the walls by which Mohammedan fanaticism has so long tried to isolate itself from the remainder of the world. Sill more is this the case with the construction of the Canal of Suez, which opens to the civilization of the Christian countries a new and wide road to the intellects and minds of the Egyptian Mohammedans, which, it is believed, no obstruction will ever be able again to block up. The results of this contact between Egypt and Christian Europe and America are already apparent. The fanatical customs which the Mohammedans, like those of other countries, used to indulge in with regard to Christians, begin to disappear one by one. The growth of some of the Egyptian cities is marvelous. Alexandria, which, at the close of the eighteenth century, had only six thousand, in 1820 only fifteen thousand inhabitants, has now over two hundred thousand. The rule of the Khedive has been extended far southward into Central Africa and on the coasts of the Red Sea, and it appears to be highly probable that his ambitious scheme of building up a vast civilized African Empire has good prospects of being realized.

Art. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A German theologian, Hermann L. Strack, announces in a pamphlet recently published that he will devote himself to the study of the present so-called Masoretic text of our Hebrew Old Testament. (*Prolegomena critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum quibus agitur I. de codicibus et de perditis et adhuc extantibus II. de textu Bibliorum Hebraicorum qualis Talmuditarum temporibus fuerit. Leips.*, 1873.) This is a work which will require immense labor, and the learned theologians of Germany are glad that a young enthusiast has been found who does not shrink from it. The pamphlet, which is, at the same time, the first installment of the researches of the author, is dedicated to Professor Delitzsch, well known as one of the foremost scholars of German Lutheran theology.

Prof. Hilgenfeld, of Jena, has published the first critical edition of the old Latin translation of Hermae Pastor, one of the earliest literary productions of the Christian Church. (*Hermae Pastor, Veterem Latinam interpretationem codicibus ed. Leips.*, 1873.) It is regarded as a very valuable aid to the right understanding of a book to which the early Church assigned a place among the works of the Apostolic Fathers.

Of the History of the Times of the New Testament, by Prof. Hausrath, of Heidelberg, the third volume has been published. (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Heidelberg*, 1873.) It contains the time of the Martyrs and the post-Apostolic Age.

One of the standard works of the Lutheran literature of Germany, the "Apologetic Essays on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity," by Professor Luthardt in Leipsic,) *Apologetische Beiträge, etc. Leips.*, 1873,) has appeared in an eighth edition.

An important work (*Der Jesuites Orders nach seiner Verfassung und Doctrin, Wirksamkeit und Geschichte charakterisirt. Berlin*, 1873) on the Jesuits has been published by Professor Huber of Munich, one of the leaders of the Old Catholic movement. The literature on the Jesuits is already immense, and the mere collection of the titles of the books fills several volumes, but the subject is far from being exhausted. Even a good history of the Order remains yet to be written. The work of Cretineau Joly (six volumes) contains all that the friends of the Order can supply, but a similar work from the stand-point of impartial history does not yet exist. The new work of Professor Huber is generally considered as the most thorough and truthful review of the famous Order and its work which has thus far appeared, though it does not pretend to be a complete history. From the great activity which Professor Huber displays in organizing the resistance of Catholic Germany to the doctrine of papal infallibility, and in bringing about the expulsion of the Jesuits from the country, many have expected from the title of the book a passionate attack upon the Order. This expectation is disappointed, for Huber's book is a calm, truly scientific account, based

on a very extensive and thorough study of all the important sources. It is very far from sustaining all the charges which in the course of time have been made against the Order and found general circulation. The "Monita Secreta," which, after all that eminent Protestant historians, like Ranke, have said on the subject, are still often quoted as a work of the Jesuits, are declared by Huber to be a satire on the Order. It is shown that the notorious principle, "The aim sanctifies the means," which appears to be irrevocably fastened upon the Jesuits, appears only in a few books published by Jesuits, though it was often enough applied by them in practice. Of the famous work of the Spanish Jesuit Mariana, which is generally quoted in support of the charge that the Jesuits taught the doctrine of regicide, Huber says that it has been less read than condemned. He also admits that the policy of Portuguese, Spanish, and French statesmen who expelled the Order about the middle of the sixteenth century cannot be fully approved. He recognizes the zeal and the success of the Jesuits in their foreign missions, and their exertions in behalf of education and science. After thus having, as an impartial historian, stated all that can be said in praise of the Order or in refutation of false charges, his final summing up of the whole case, and his opinion of the work of the Jesuits in general, and of their influence upon the Catholic world, is all the more impressive. He finds that the services which this Order rendered to the Popes gradually inspired it with a feeling of arrogance; that, impelled by this arrogance, they aimed at the highest power in the Church, and endeavored to force their peculiar theological opinions upon the whole Church, to make the Pope dependent upon their Order, to overthrow all that has survived of the ancient constitution of the Church, and to crush all schools of theology which refused to accept their peculiar theories. It disfigured and falsified the ancient creed of the Church, corrupted theological ethics, and in consequence exercised a baneful influence upon society; it defended papal absolutism and a mechanical centralization; it promoted the darkest and most absurd superstition, and reduced the Church to a state of lethargy which will make reformatory movements within the Church impossible.

ITALY.

The rich literature on the Vatican Council will receive an important addition by the publication of a work which may be regarded as its official history. Pius IX. has appointed an Italian priest, Cecconi, as the historian of the Council, and gives him permission to use the archives of Rome to that end. The work is to consist of several volumes; the first part, which has been published at the beginning of the present year, embraces only the preparations to the Council. Although the work is intended to be an apology, and although, therefore, many of its statements will be received with mistrust, it contains a number of facts which were as yet unknown, and also publishes many of the official documents relating to the Council for the first time. We learn from this work that Pius IX. on Dec. 6, 1864, that is to say immediately before the publication of the

Syllabus, informed several cardinals who were assembled in the Vatican at a meeting of the congregation of the rites, under the seal of the strictest secrecy, that the idea of convoking an Œcumenical Council had occupied him for some time. All the cardinals present were requested to communicate their opinion to the Pope in writing. Twenty-one responded to this invitation. Two spoke against the convocation of a Council; one could not make up his mind whether he was for or against; four considered the present time inopportune, the others regarded the convocation of the Council as necessary. Among the objections raised against the Council was the fear that parties might arise in the Council, and some bishops might call for an untimely enlargement of the episcopal functions. With regard to the subjects to be brought before the Council only two cardinals mentioned the Infallibility of the Pope. At the beginning of March, 1865, the Pope appointed a particular "Directing Congregation" for the convocation of the Council, consisting of five cardinals, whose number was subsequently increased to eight. This Congregation discussed, among others, the question "Whether and in what manner the College of Cardinals should be consulted before the bull of convocation was issued," and it decided that the sacred college should be consulted in whatever manner the Pope saw fit to do it. During the next following years the College of Cardinals was not consulted at all. On May 17, 1868, the Directing Congregation resolved to propose to the Pope to hear the opinion of the College of Cardinals on the time when the Council should be opened, but on the other hand to leave the drawing up of the bull of convocation entirely to the Directing Congregation, and not to allow any discussion on it in the consistory, (meeting of all the cardinals,) "as the time was pressing, and as this course of action was authorized by the present custom, according to which the more prompt business way of the Congregation had taken the place of the discussions of the consistory." Accordingly the Pope, on July 22, 1868, only asked the cardinals assembled in consistory the question whether they agreed that the bull convoking the Council on Dec. 8, 1869, should be issued on June 29. All the twenty-seven cardinals who were present answered "Placet," and the bull of convocation was signed by all the cardinals present in Rome. In April, 1865, thirty-six bishops of the Latin rite, in February, 1866, a few oriental bishops, in March, 1866, a few bishops of the Greek rite, in Austria, had been notified, under the seal of the most profound secrecy, of the project of convoking a Council, and they had been invited to indicate what subjects appeared to them appropriate for the work of the Council. Of the Latin bishops, three expressed doubts with regard to the opportuneness of convoking an Œcumenical Council; "some" mentioned Papal Infallibility as one of the truths the Council ought to promulgate. As a subject specially worthy of the attention of the Council, the bishops designated the relation between Church and State. They considered it necessary to take in hand again the decree on the princes which the Council of Trent was induced by the kings of that time and their advisers not to publish, and

to state to the secular governments the conditions under which they would be able, even at this time, to satisfy the higher law of God, Jesus Christ, and his Church, to secure the divine blessing, and thus, perhaps, to secure the true basis of their existence here on earth." Some of the oriental bishops expressed the opinion that those oriental bishops who are not in communion with the Holy See should also be invited to attend the Council. With regard to this point, the Directing Synod, in March, 1868, unanimously resolved to issue simultaneously the bull of convocation, but separate from it, an invitation to the schismatic patriarchs and bishops to return to the unity of the Catholic Church in order to be able to take part in the Council. The Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, Valerga, and other prelates, were to support this invitation by personal negotiations. With regard to the so-called Jansenist, or Old Catholic bishops of Holland, it was resolved to take no special notice of them. As regards the invitation to the Protestants, the Pope ordered a proof of the letter of invitation to be sent to Archbishop Manning of Westminster, in order to "hear the tried advice of a man who, by constant contact with Protestants, would know accurately their feelings and disposition." The attitude to be observed with regard to the secular governments caused considerable trouble to the Directing Congregation. The secretary of the Congregation, Archbishop Gianelli, expressed the fear that the bishops of France, Italy, and Portugal might be forbidden from attending the Council, and he advised to dispose Napoleon favorably toward the Council. The Congregation, however, decided the question whether the secular government should previously be consulted about the expediency of convoking the Council in the negative. The question was not resumed until May 17, 1868, when the Congregation declared in favor of presenting to the Catholic courts a printed copy of the bull of convocation simultaneously with its publication. The Pope confirmed this proposition, which was subsequently extended to all sovereigns represented in Rome by diplomatic agents. The question whether the Catholic princes should be invited to attend the Council was decided in the negative, on the ground that at the present time there were no Catholic princes who were both willing and able to carry out all the decrees of the Church. Six days, however, before the publication of the bull, a compromise was agreed upon, by, it seems, the advice of Cardinal Antonelli. It was decided that the bull was not to contain an express invitation to the princes, but that at the same time it should be so worded that there would be no obstacle to their participation if they desired it. As regards the persons to be invited to take part in the Council, the Congregation proposed, and the Pope decided, to invite a number of dignitaries, such as titular bishops, abbots, generals of monastic orders, who, according to the law of the ancient Church, would not have had the right of voting. The result was that more than one sixth of all the fathers of the Council were found to be no diocesan bishops, and according to the ancient Church law not entitled to the seat. The transactions of the Directing Congregations on the order of business to be followed by the

Council had only one aim in view—to give to the Pope the most absolute control over the proceedings of the Council. While intended as a defense of the Papal policy, the book of Cecconi is full of facts which, to every unprejudiced mind, leave no doubt as to the utter corruption which pervades the Papal Church.

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Everlasting Punishment attended with Everlasting Decay. A Discourse. By a Congregational Pastor. 24mo., paper cover, pp. 48. Chicago: A. S. Barnes & Co.

The theory of our Congregational pastor is that hell is an eternal prison, where each soul, being in solitary confinement, goes *toward* unconsciousness and nothingness by "decay," never reaching nothingness, but often, perhaps, reaching unconsciousness. Eternal life through Christ is everlasting growth in being and glory; eternal death is endless diminution in vitality, both conscious and essential. But as wickedness has in itself a depraved vigor and vitality, antithetic to the true life, so the most wicked of sinners endure and suffer in consciousness the longest. Probably the sinners against the Holy Ghost retain an eternal *conscious* misery. Thus the number of "stripes" is as the amount of sin and guilt. The theory is wrought out with great ingenuity and considerable grace of style. The pamphlet is a prelude to a volume in preparation in support of the same view.

The author claims that he is within the limits of orthodoxy in maintaining these views. He gives us the following programme of retributive belief at the present day:

I. Universalist.—Punishment temporary, (resulting in everlasting happiness.)
II. Annihilation.—Punishment everlasting in its evil results.
III. Orthodox.—Punishment everlasting in itself—that is, in its operation upon its victims, even every one of them; but either—
(1.) Resulting in everlasting decay, with final loss of conscious existence (that is, with "few stripes") to such as "knew not their Lord's will;" or,
(2.) Resulting in everlasting growth, or progress of every individual in sin and sorrow forever.

To all this we may add that if we understand the awkward language of Hagenbach, as translated vol. i, p. 380, Augustine held nearly the view of our Congregational Pastor. Pelagius balanced his lax heterodoxy by the terribleness of his hell; while Augustine "urged milder views in opposition to him, in accordance with the highest principle: He shall have justice without mercy who showed no mercy. With his supposition, as already

intimated, of a gradual diminution of punishment, and of degrees in the same, the gradual vanishing of it was put at a minimum."

We do not suppose that thought and discussion on this subject can be avoided even within the limits of the evangelical Church. There are minds, indeed, to whom the severest views of hell seem not only congenial and necessary to their Christian consciousness, but vital to the permanence of the orthodox faith and to the deterring sinners from sin. But there are also other minds, equally pure, and in other respects orthodox, to whom such a retribution is utterly unthinkable.

Perhaps we may say, (as evinced by Priest Walworth's book on hell, quoted in our last Quarterly,) there seem to be more variation of conception, a more tolerant comprehension, and less rigidly asserted severity of hell in the Romish than in most parts of the Protestant Church. After the age of Origen there was a period of the great prevalence of Restorationism in the Eastern Church. This was checked and overcome by the just reaction of the sounder Western Church upon the Eastern. But even the Western Church compromised the matter. It made its doctrine comfortable by accepting purgatory for tolerably good Christians, and keeping eternal misery for incorrigible sinners, infidels, and pagans. This doctrine of purgatory, backed by a possible hell beyond, as being immediate, limited, and conceivable, has a far more impressive effect in maintaining the power of the Romish Church than the more distant, and less easily grasped and believed, doctrine of an eternal misery for all sinners, great and small. And then, as a further mitigation, since the true heaven was the pure "vision of God," so all below that divine "vision" was "hell," even though some compartments thereof (those especially for infants damned) might be *happier than this world.* Yet a large range was allowed for "opinion" upon which Infallibility pronounced no sentence. Free sweep was afforded to the popular preacher for descriptions of hell, surpassing the powers of Elder Knapp or Benjamin Abbott, but they were uttered upon the authority of the individual. When the churchman was called to account for such descriptions, he was entitled to reply that *he* was bound only by the creed of Trent, and Trent had not pronounced upon the subject. But the "theology of the Reformation" swept away all these reserves and mitigations. Not only was full freedom allowed for the most vivid individual imagination, released from Scripture limitations, in drawing pictures of hell, but a doubt of the truth of these pictures was, and still is, an untolerated heterodoxy.

Our impression is that at the present day, whatever may be the immediate effect of the severest doctrines and most vivid picturings of hell, the general result is, with an immense class of minds, skepticism. There is a large Protestant public who ask: "Can it be that non-Christian philanthropists, who shame most Christians by their purity and nobleness of life, like Franklin, Jefferson, and John Stuart Mill, go to a hell of inexpressible eternal torment?" With this question Romanism has no difficulty. Priest Walworth can reply: "They are, as violating the first Table of the Decalogue, unquestionably excluded from the 'vision of God,' and so in hell, or at least in purgatory; from which last, if you are deeply interested for them, you would do well to pray, with agony and tears, that they may be released. If they are in hell, there are compartments in hell more happy than this world, in which, perhaps, God eternally places them. Priest Such-a-one does, indeed, preach, with amazing power, that as leaders of mankind from the true Church, they are fried in the hottest place of hell forever. I do not pretend to know; for the Church has not pronounced on this question, and I am responsible only for the decrees of Trent. But all such men had better beware lest Priest Such-a-one tells the awful truth. Let us all, by entire self-consecration, make sure of the divine vision." But to the above question what answer can Protestantism, firmly and without misgivings, give? We doubt whether Rome does not here excel us, with all our boasted Protestant right of private judgment, in allowing a range of individualities and yet securing the permanence of her churchly doctrines.

Viewed as an individual opinion, or as a hypothesis to be used to solve objection, rather than a *doctrine*, we see no call for endeavoring to put a silencer upon the argument of the Congregational Pastor. There are numerous such hypotheses of hell, which can neither be proved nor disproved by Scripture, by which nobody is bound, and which cannot rightfully be advanced as the doctrine of the Church to which the advocate belongs, but which are allowable, by a liberal comprehension, as individualisms or as hypotheses. The whole argument of Edwards to justify eternal damnation is based upon the assumption, unaffirmed by Scripture, that hell must be perpetuated eternally to overawe the universe into obedience. Equally hypothetical is Edwards' opinion that the damned eternally increase in misery; a hypothesis furnished to make hell as terrible as possible. Equally hypothetical is the doctrine of the infinite evil of the least sin, designed to justify a

punishment limitless in duration. Equally hypothetical again is the pleasant doctrine of the eternal increase of the happiness of the saved. Equally hypothetical is the assumption, now generally adopted, that the Scripture language describing the fire of hell is figurative language. Equally hypothetical, again, is the assumption that the damned eternally *will* themselves to be damned, a theory invented to evince the justice of eternal damnation. And, finally, no more hypothetical, and no more provable or disproveable by Scripture, is the Congregational Pastor's theory of eternal diminution. Held as an individual solution, and not preached as his Church doctrine, and rendering nobody but himself responsible, it is just as entitled to tolerance as either of the above hypotheses. The doctrines of restorationism and of *post mortem* probation stand on a different footing. They contradict a dogma which both the Catholic and Protestant Churches have persistently and earnestly pronounced; the dogma, namely, that death in impenitence is the remediless catastrophe of our being. Hope held out to the dying impenitent is not only unscriptural and untraditional, but is an encouragement to impenitence. Nor is it a mere *hypothesis to justify the orthodox doctrine*, but a heterodox doctrine.

And here comes in our reply to our friends of the "Universalist Quarterly," who ask, Why not now, as in the primitive Church, unite comprehensively in promoting the kingdom of Christ, irrespective of differing doctrinal views? Our first reply is that we know no reason for believing that before Origen there was any Universalism in the primitive Church, and even Origen held it esoterically, with full and fatal admission that its publication was demoralizing. Secondly, we are very fearful that, with the exception of the rare few, Universalism affords no real spiritual life to its believers. We know some lay Methodist Universalists who exhibit to us all the fruits of the Spirit; but when we ask them why they stay Methodists, their reply is apt to be that they get more spiritual food where they are. When we ask them if that can be true Christianity which generally tends to starve its believers, we get no satisfactory reply. Thirdly, between Universalism and Orthodoxy there is not merely *variation* but direct *antagonism* in the necessary practical methods for conversion of sinners, to allow harmonious co-operation. When, for instance, in a revival the Orthodox preacher, unfolding the terrors of the law to the stricken conscience, urges *now* as the only sure time for repentance, he cannot afford to be succeeded by a preacher who

disarms the law of its terrors and holds that repentance may be postponed beyond death. Hope for dying impenitence is full of fatal lethargy for Church and sinner.

Between orthodoxy and so discordant, not to say so delusive, a scheme, therefore, an impossibility of co-operation is no proscription or illiberality. We have no respect for a jealous heresy-hunting, or for an irritable inquisitorial orthodoxy. But for the firmness with which a Church maintains those well-defined dogmas which she believes to be contained in Scripture, knows to have been ratified by the *consensus* of the holy of old, and sees to be the secret of her success in the salvation of men, we have a profound respect and approbation. She has a right to see, peremptorily, that her pulpits be not turned as batteries against her own cherished organic truths. Against such a right a pseudo-liberalism raises her outcry in vain.

A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of Christendom. With Illustrations from their Original Standards. By Dr. GEORGE BENEDICT WINER, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Edited from the last Edition, with an Introduction by Rev. WILLIAM B. POPE, Professor of Theology, Didsbury College, Manchester. 8vo., pp. 392. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1873. [Received from Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. Price, Three Dollars.]

As Comparative Theology is an exhibit of the various religious systems of mankind in their resemblances or differences with each other and with Christianity, so Comparative Dogmatics is a synoptical presentation of the various beliefs within Christianity itself. Comparative Dogmatics differs from the History of Doctrines by presenting the various creeds as contemporaneous, while the latter traces their origin and progressive development. Doctrinal history allows some scope for one-sided and partisan coloring; while Comparative Dogmatics, constructed according to rule, approaches an exact science, compelling the accord of all sides.

Professor Pope, in his scholarly and elegant Introduction, truly remarks that Comparative Dogmatics has received little attention from English theologians, including, we may add, their American brethren. America has produced one respectable History of Doctrines, (Shedd's,) and one revised translation of a German history, (Smith's Hagenbach.) Both are written from a special stand-point, and need to be counterbalanced by a historian or two from our own Church. In treating Arminianism Shedd is a most pitiable blunderer, as we showed in our notice of his work. But in Comparative Dogmatics, until the reproduction of this work from

Germany, neither England nor America had produced any thing.

Though in Winer's own modes of expression there are phrases enough to indicate a decided anti-Calvinian bias, the creeds and standards themselves are presented with great exactness in their original languages, untranslated. The creed of the Russian Church is left in its original modern Greek. Yet the work, great as is its value, is curiously incomplete. Constructed early in the present century, the systems presented are the Roman, Greek, Protestant, Socinian, Quaker! Winer knows nothing of Anglican, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Methodist. Professor Pope undertakes not to supplement, but ingeniously sketches a programme for each student to furnish a supplement for himself. The work of Winer stands alone as a strictly impartial undogmatic presentation of dogmas. As a beginning it is precisely the right thing; and then it is precisely the right thing for the theological inquirer to finish it.

Professor Pope's Introduction is a condensed but masterly survey of the whole ground, full of valuable suggestions expressed in lucid language. We are dissatisfied with nothing but his classification of Methodist doctrines in the dogmatical synopsis. We beg leave, in the name of American Methodism, to enter our firm fraternal protest against being recorded before the eyes of the world as training under the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England! But before our statement of our protest let us fairly present the statement against which our protest is made:

> It may be said that English Methodism has no distinct Articles of Faith. At the same time it is undoubtedly true that no community in Christendom is more effectually hedged about by confessional obligations and restraints. Reference has been made to the distinction of Creeds, Confessions, and Standards. Methodism combines the three in its doctrinal constitution after a manner on the whole peculiar to itself. Materially if not formally, virtually if not actually, implicitly if not avowedly, its theology is bound by the ancient Œcumenical Creeds, by the Articles of the English Church, and by comprehensive standards of its own—the peculiarity of its maintenance of these respectively having been determined by the specific circumstances of its origin and consolidation, circumstances into which it is not our business here to enter. In common with most Christian Churches it holds fast the Catholic symbols: the Apostolical and Nicene are extensively used in its liturgy, and the Athanasian, not so used, is accepted so far as concerns its doctrinal type. *The doctrine of the Articles of the Church of England is the doctrine of Methodism.* This assertion must be, of course, taken broadly, as subject to many qualifications. For instance: the Connection has never avowed the Articles as its Confession of Faith; some of those Articles have no meaning for it in its pres-

ent constitution; others of them are tolerated in their vague and doubtful bearing rather than accepted, as definitions; and, finally, many Methodists would prefer to disown any relation to them of any kind. Still, the verdict of the historical theologian, who takes a comprehensive view of the estate of Christendom in regard to the history and development of Christian truth, would locate the Methodist community under the Thirty-nine Articles. He would draw his inference from the posture toward them of the early founders of the system; and he would not fail to mark that the American branch of the family, which has spread simultaneously with its European branch, has retained the *Articles of the English Church, with some necessary modifications, as the basis of its Confession of Faith.* Setting aside the articles that have to do with discipline rather than doctrine, the Methodists universally hold the remainder as tenaciously as any of those who sign them, and with as much consistency as the great mass of English divines who have given them an Arminian interpretation. That is to say, where they diverge in doctrine from the Westminster Confession, Methodism holds to them; while this Confession rather expresses their views on Presbyterian Church government. It may suffice to say generally on this subject, that so far as concerns the present volume, every quotation from the English Articles may stand, if justly interpreted, as a representative of the Methodist Confession. Finally, we have the Methodist Standards, belonging to it as a society within a Church, which entirely regulate the faith of the community, but are binding only upon its ministers. Those Standards are to be found in certain rather extensive theological writings which have none of the features of a Confession of Faith, and are never subscribed or accepted as such. More particularly, there are some Sermons and Expository Notes of John Wesley; more generally, these and other writings, catechisms, and early precedents of doctrinal definition; taken as a whole, they indicate a standard of experimental and practical theology to which the teaching and preaching of its ministers are universally conformed. What that standard prescribes in detail it would be impossible to define here. It is not our task to furnish the supplement to our volume, but to point out what it includes, and how it may be made. Suffice that the Methodist doctrine is what is generally termed Arminian as it regards the relation of the human race to redemption; that it lays great stress upon the personal assurance which seals the personal religion of the believer; and that it includes a strong testimony to the office of the Holy Spirit in the entire renewal of the soul in holiness as one of the provisions of the covenant of grace upon earth. It may be added, though only as a historical fact, that a rigorous maintenance of this common standard of evangelical doctrine has been attended by the preservation of a remarkable unity of doctrine throughout this large communion.—Pp. lxxvi–lxxviii.

If a historical theologian is to represent the belief of a body of Christians said to amount to fifteen millions, it would certainly become him not to huddle them under a certain symbol with which they had merely some historical connection; but to condescend to inquire what they do truly believe, and what is the truly accurate expression of their belief in words. And certainly very few intelligent members of that fifteen millions could read the Thirty-nine Articles and say they were the accurate expression of their belief. Professor Pope's reference to America

proves the reverse of his statement. Roughly we may say that of the Thirty-nine Articles we have rejected fourteen, reducing them to twenty-five, and of those twenty-five we have rejected essential parts, so that but about one half of the whole are by us accepted. The "necessary modifications" to which the Professor refers were with a single exception "necessary," because we did not doctrinally believe them. We refused to be classed under that symbol. The historian who should so classify us would therefore mis-state our position, directly in the face of our most solemn act. Surely Professor Pope speaks from very slight examination when he says that "setting aside the Articles that have to do with doctrine rather than discipline, the Methodists *universally* hold the remainder as tenaciously as any of those who sign them!" The entire body of Methodists of the United States no more hold the Thirty-nine Articles, doctrinally, than they do the Westminster Confession. They reject a large share of both for the same reason, namely, that they are, in their proper interpretation, Calvinistic. Nor does this confession express their views on Presbyterian Church government; for the "Confession" affirms the divine obligation of Presbyterianism, and the large body of American Methodists believe in the right of a voluntary Episcopacy.

As for "the posture toward them (the Articles) of the early founders of the system," it seems sufficient to say that it was by Wesley's own hand that this more than half was rejected. If Wesley's "posture" is to be sponsor for acceptance of the Articles it would be equally good for a rejection of the Presbyterianism of the Confession, especially as he provided an Episcopate for English Methodism by the Episcopal ordination of Alexander Mather. The fact that a "great mass of English divines" have "given the Articles an Arminian interpretation" can be nothing to us. We doubtless could sign them under express stipulation that we might give them our own interpretation, but even that would not justify a historian in fictitiously assigning those Articles as the proper expression of the belief of our body, and thus misleading the student of history into a false idea. Arminius signed the Belgic Confession, but that could never justify a historian in putting that Confession in the Arminian column. When Methodism—at any rate American Methodism—is placed in the scheme of Doctrines, it must be by the same method as Winer selects for Arminians, Socinians, and Quakers; namely, by giving first our twenty five articles, and then the remaining points

by extracts from standard authors. Indeed, our views are most lucidly expressed in most of the Arminian extracts given by Winer; the remainder could be furnished from Wesley, and, perhaps, Fletcher.

Our scholarly theologians will find Winer, as expounded by Pope, a valuable and suggestive work. It is, indeed, *the* work in this most important department. While the empty declamations against creeds are in noisy progress, and while the divisive effects of varying dogmas are daily and delightfully diminishing, the study of creeds and doctrines, and the survey of the doctrinal history of the Church, are in no degree losing their interest or value.

A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle to the Ephesians. By JOHN EADIE, LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church. Second Edition. Revised throughout and enlarged. 8vo., pp. 504. London: Griffin, Bohn, & Co. 1861.

As a commentator on single books of the New Testament Dr. Eadie is scarcely surpassed. Less exclusively verbal than Ellicott, he is scarcely less accurately philological, and his freer range renders his work less arid and more readable. He brings in a large amount of moral, spiritual, and theological reflection, giving more body, roundness, and color to the philological skeleton. As a Scotch Presbyterian he is of course professedly Calvinistic, though his heart is so Arminian that he abundantly contradicts himself, being alternately on each side of the Synod of Dort, now chiming with Episcopius and now with Bogerman. In defending his Calvinism he takes ground of mere *foreknowledge*, which is Arminianism. Anon, he tells us that predestination and freedom are irreconcilable, but both true, which is virtual confession that Calvinism as a solution of divine government is failure. Finally, as if to save his orthodoxy, he chalks up to true fatalism, yet with an obvious feeling that his own fatalistic statement has in it not a little of the appalling.

With entire conclusiveness Dr. Eadie shows that *εὐδοκία*, rendered "good pleasure," in Eph. i, 5, should be rendered "benignant purpose," that is, *benevolence* or *beneficence*. We are, then, "predestinated," not "according to the *good pleasure* of his will," but *according to the beneficence of his will*. One of the pet phrases of arbitrary absolutism, therefore, in which Calvinism intrenches itself, is demolished. In both the Septuagint and the

New Testament the use of the word is uniform; and so an English phrase which sounds like a curt, peremptory, omnipotent silencer upon all inquiry, is really a term for divine liberality. The election of Eph. i is not based by St. Paul in an austere, divine reserve, but in an open, free beneficence.

Our hearty thanks are due to the independence and honesty of Dr. Eadie, in rescuing this most beautiful word, *εὐδοκία*, *beneficence*, from the sad perversion by which Calvinism has made it a most repulsive cant term for a reasonless despotism on the part of the wise and blessed God. This abuse of this sweet word is constantly occurring in Calvinistic standard writings. Thus Calvin: "God hath a sufficient, just cause of his election and reprobation in his *own will* or *pleasure*." And so Archbishop Usher thus stultifies Omniscience by making God act by mere will without just cause: "There is, indeed, no cause of reprobation in the reprobate that they, rather than others, are passed by of God; that is, wholly from the unsearchable depths of God's free *will* and *good pleasure*." And so Dr. Eadie's countryman, Dr. Dick: "If there was sin in the reprobate, there was sin also in the elect; and we must therefore resolve their opposite allotments into the *will* of God, who gives and withholds his favor according to his *good pleasure*." How men, learned men, good men, should be so fascinated with the work of exhibiting perpetually so disgusting a caricature of our holy God is a problem we attempt not to solve.

But one of the grandest battles of the commentators on Ephesians is fought over Eph. ii, 3: "Were by nature children of wrath even as others." Does this text teach an inborn depravity, depravity in our nature? Does it mean that our nature at birth is under damnation? And this last question truly involves "infant damnation." If the child before responsible action is damned in the womb, its final damnation is just. Nay, the whole race might justly be born and damned, without an actual sin, and without a Saviour, to hell forever. And that, as we all know, is the fundamental Calvinistic assumption. This assumption is claimed as necessary in order to show that the gift of Christ is pure "grace;" and in order to show that a part might be elected by pure "good pleasure," and the rest left as reprobate, to their own previously damned state. For Calvinism this text is a Thermopylæ, a narrow pass in which it intrenches itself for dear life.

Dr. Eadie shows conclusively, we think, that "children of

wrath" signifies, not, *liable to a possible wrath*, but "involved in wrath," the wrath lying in actual contact on the object. So far Calvinism and Arminianism must agree. "Children of disobedience," in verse two, is in the Greek, "sons of disobedience;" and Ellicott and others say that "children" implies a stronger and nearer connection than "sons." The statement is, however, untenable. Children of "wisdom," in Matt. xi, 19, expresses no stronger relation than "sons of disobedience." Yet these, and perhaps all the parallel phrases, imply contactual relation.

But the vital contest is upon φύσει, "*by nature.*" And here we think the definition of nature credited to the German commentator Harless is the true one: *that which is born or grows, in antithesis to that which is made. Nature* is never *made;* it is *born* and *becomes.* Dr. Eadie illustrates this with a rich variety of Greek quotations. He does not deny that the term is sometimes used as second *nature;* the superstratum deposited by habit over our primary character. Nor could he deny, we suppose, that the superstratum of regeneration, though a result of an act, and truly *made*, is called a *nature.* Nor, although God is neither born nor grows, do we hesitate to speak of the divine *nature.* Yet Dr. Eadie is justified in maintaining that these secondary and sporadic meanings cannot stand before the normal and ordinary definition. The true ordinary meaning of "nature" must be accepted.

One of the most acute of German commentators, however, Dr. Meyer, denies that a *nature*, in this sense, under *wrath*, is Paul's doctrine. He maintains that the apostle teaches that all penalty is the result of *actual* sin, and all wrath rests upon a developed *nature.* He refers to Rom. v, 12, where it is said that all die *because all sin.* When asked then why infants penally die, he replies, *the apostle did not think of that question!* This reply will not satisfy "New England theology," nor our poor New York theology either. Macknight, followed by Dr. Clarke, denies that original sin appears in the text, and both quote a number of Greek passages in support of their views. Yet in every one of these quotations the predicate is truly affirmed of the inborn nature base. Wesley, on the other hand, explicitly affirms that Paul lays the wrath of God upon our inborn nature. Against the Pelagian view, which denies original depravation to be found in this text, Dr. Eadie's victory is, we think, complete. Standing alone, the text would not be sufficient to establish original sin;

but coming in as auxiliary with Rom. v, 12–21, it is a very powerful and decisive confirmation.

Dr. Eadie, elated by this clear success, however, boldly takes a farther step, beyond St. Paul, into a most fearful position, not without tokens that a shudder passes through his moral being as he takes his stand. From affirming that our nature lies contactually under the wrath of God, he affirms that it was so *previous to and without any personal responsible act of our own!* That is quite another thing. It is one thing to affirm that our nature is under a shade, and another thing to affirm that no act of ours ever placed it there. A nature may be brought by circumstances into new relations. A nature may be hated *by us* to-day and loved to-morrow. It may be our free act that subjects our nature to the wrath of God. In the entire previous context (ver. 1 and 2) Paul is speaking of adult sinners; heathen debased by a course of sin; who had forfeited all those redemptive shields by which their infant condition was untouched by divine wrath, and had made themselves responsible for the tendencies of their nature by the actual sanctions of voluntary sin. Dr. Wilbur Fisk well says: "Guilt is not imputed until, by a voluntary rejection of the Gospel, man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his choice." Then is he, by his very *nature*, a child of wrath. (See our Note on Rom. xi, 32.) So that though our infant nature may be a child of grace, our adult nature may be a child of wrath. Infant damnation, therefore, whether in the womb or in hell, has no support from this text.

Christianity the Science of Manhood. A Book for Questioners. By Minot Judson Savage. 16mo., pp. 187. Boston: Noyes, Holmes, & Co. 1873.

Mr. Savage has in this volume rendered an excellent service to those who are skeptically inclined, and are at the same time more familiar with the questions and cavils of skepticism than with the replies and real position of orthodoxy. His own mind has traversed the whole dreary realm, with no relief from the old traditional arguments; and the line of thought which brought him into light and peace is clearly, and in quite familiar style, presented in these pages. It first sets forth man as a physical, intellectual, affectional, and religious being, whose parts, in order to a true manhood, are to be developed to individual perfection, and must be also harmoniously combined.

The ideal perfect man is the truly religious man, rightly ad-

justed to the race as a brotherhood, and also to a possible future over which a good being rules. The second part of the argument shows that in Christianity there is a central principle of love to God and man, which as a germinant, vital force, will produce this perfect manhood and elevate humanity to its highest possible condition, individually, socially, morally, and eternally. Assuming that this is the goal to be reached, it is important to know that Confucianism, Brahmanism, and the other great religions, while saying many excellent and true things, have each a widely different central idea and aim. The scientific and philosophic substitutes for Christianity are equally defective. But Christianity, and it alone, appeals to love—the one universal, governing principle of humanity—and claims a power of taking man as he is and raising him to a conformity to its own perfect ideal as shown in Jesus. It must, therefore, be the true religion, whatever be the fate of the questions of criticism respecting the Christian records. Such is Mr. Savage's argument: it waives the skeptic's questions, and takes him on his own ground. The conclusion is irresistible; surely that system which lifts up, advances, and perfects man, must be true. But our author's success is really but half achieved. If Christianity is *love*, as he says, and only that, the Boston Radicals will at once claim to become good converts. To us Christianity is a body of facts, and of doctrines based upon those facts. The questions which are waived inevitably come up again and must be settled. We do, indeed, understand that *that* love which is the essence of the Gospel system is consequent upon an acceptance of an incarnate, atoning Christ; and so, doubtless, does Mr. Savage, but he leaves his converted skeptic in ignorance of it, and in utter doubt whether he may put faith in the records which alone tell of that Christ.

Walks and Words of Jesus. A Paragraph Harmony of the Four Evangelists. By Rev. M. N. Olmstead. With an Introduction by Rev. R. S. Foster, D.D. Third Edition. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

Mr. Olmstead's purpose in the preparation of this volume is worthy of all praise. He has sought to construct from the four Gospels a single narrative of the life of Jesus, employing "every word" of the Evangelists, and arranging the events of their records in their proper chronological order. This is undoubtedly the true method of study of the life of our Lord. He has also, by means of a larger type, brought into a special prominence the

words of Jesus himself, whether in set discourses or in casual conversations, so that at a glance his utterances may be distinguished from those of other persons or of the writer's. This is a valuable feature of the book. We dissent from some of the arrangements of passages. It seems not likely, for instance, that the incidents recorded in Matt. viii, 19–22, and Luke ix, 57–62, occurred twice, and yet Mr. Olmstead so reckons them, and puts them eighty pages apart. It cannot be that Peter's denial of his Lord was more than once predicted; but Mr. Olmstead represents it as foretold three times, twice at the passover-table, and once after the crossing over the Kedron. Not a few similar instances occur where an event which clearly, as we think, occurred but once, appears twice in the narrative. This is, to say the least, a very easy way of constructing a harmony, and equally unsatisfactory. And why place the resurrection of Lazarus before the mission of the seventy—four months too early? Or the interview with the Greeks, which, according to John, was immediately followed by the final departure from the temple, before the cursing of the fig-tree and the cleansing of the temple? Or the selection of the twelve half a dozen chapters after the Sermon on the Mount, which it really preceded? All these are important points in a harmonized narrative of our Lord's life. These points, however, to which most scholars would object, do not obscure the divine lessons of the book. It may be recommended to the people as a striking and instructive exhibition of Jesus speaking to the people.

Apologetic Lectures on the Moral Truths of Christianity. Delivered in Leipsic in the Winter of 1872. By CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT, Doctor and Professor of Theology. Translated from the German by Sophia Taylor. Crown 8vo., pp. 405. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1873.

These lectures properly constitute the Third Part of the author's Apology for Christianity. The first course, on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity, was delivered in 1864; the second, on the Saving Truths of Christianity, in 1867; and they are now supplemented by the ten lectures in the present volume on the Moral Truths of Christianity. Indeed, the defense would have been incomplete without them, for, as Dr. Luthardt well observes, "unless Christianity can prove itself to be the moral power of public and private life, all other proofs will be in vain." Theology teaches what is matter of faith, but the world to-day demands that what is thus taught shall be made evident in the lives and

actions of men. . This volume undertakes, therefore, the unfolding of the system of Christian ethics, basing it firmly upon the teachings of Holy Scripture. The necessity of this basis for the best life of the individual, of society, and of the State, appears in the first lecture, on the Nature of Christian Morality. But such a morality "presupposes the Christian, and the Christian presupposes the man." Man as he is exhibited in the second lecture, and the Christian, or man truly such, renewed by a new birth, in the third. Virtue lies in the disposition of the heart; its essence is love, the ideal of true morality, out of which all the other virtues grow. The ground is thus laid for a beautiful elucidation of Christian relations and duties in accordance with the inculcations of the New Testament. The work is not then to take rank with the mass of our deistic text-books on moral science. Written from the Lutheran stand-point, it is neither Augustinian nor Pelagian, nor yet is it Wesleyan. Less profoundly scientific than Wuttke's, it is more thoroughly practical, while its clear style and elegant diction at once take the reader captive.

Short Sermons on Consecration and Kindred Themes: for the Closet, the Fireside, and the Lecture-room. By Rev. A. C. GEORGE, D.D., of the Central New York Conference, Author of "Counsels to Converts," "The Satisfactory Portion," etc. 12mo., pp. 306. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

"These," as the author says in his preface, "are not elaborate sermons, but simply suggestions toward discourses bearing some relation to the great theme of Christian consecration." They are thirty-four in number, some discussing themes as fully and at as great length as befits an ordinary sermon, others containing only the material of a five minutes' exhortation. A third of them, perhaps, bear directly upon the subject of holiness, and almost all the others discuss cognate topics. The subjects of the sketches are well selected—"Consecration: its Nature and Obligation," "Consecration a Constant Service," "The Separating Power of the Divine Presence," "The Inspiration of a Great Presence," "A Drift or a Voyage," "Life, Capital for Immortality," "The Eternity of Character," etc.

It is a good book. The "Sermon" is indeed very short, oftimes, but clear, to the point, and strong. The style is correct, forcible, and often eloquent; the spirit is devout, the whole tendency purifying and elevating. The work abounds in illus-

trations, sometimes original, sometimes cited and the authors named, but all apt and interesting, and frequently very striking and beautiful. The very brevity of the several discourses, while it precludes exhaustive discussion, makes the volume more available for the purposes of that wise economy which gathers up fragments of time, "that nothing be lost."

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians. By HEINRICH AUGUST, WILHELM MEYER, Th. D., Oberconsistorialrath, Hanover. Translated from the fifth edition of the German by G. H. VENABLES. 8vo., pp. 354. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1873.

This is the first installment we have received of the English translation of Dr. Meyer's very able commentary on the New Testament, now being issued from the press of the Clarks. The entire work will be heartily welcomed by our scholarly ministers and biblical students. It annotates, of course, the Greek text very thoroughly and accurately. Meyer's first principle is that the true commentator, as such, owes no allegiance to creeds or churchly confessions. His single work is to find the true intentional meaning of the sacred writer. In his independence we think him sometimes erratic; but in general his insight and power of unfolding the true vein of sacred thought is rarely, if ever, surpassed. We have used his volumes upon previous Epistles to great advantage, and can, therefore, speak from some experience.

The first volume of Romans has also been issued. The publishers announce that two volumes more of the work may be issued by next spring; but so great care has to be taken to secure accuracy, as well as to obtain the author's latest corrections, that the issue of the volumes may be somewhat delayed.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Die Geheimnisse des Glaubens, (The Mysteries of Faith, etc.) Von LUDWIG SCHÖBERLEIN, *Dr. der Philosophie und Theologie.* Heidelberg, 1872.

Dr. Schöberlein has earned the reputation of an able and orthodox Lutheran theologian. Some of his monographs are classic pieces of theological speculation. The present work is an effort to help the devout thinker to the fullest practicable comprehension

of the more mysterious of the doctrines of Christianity. It consists of ten essays (422 octavo pages) on the subjects: "The Essence and Certainty of Faith," "The Trinity," "The Unity of God and Man in Christ," "The Atonement," "Miracles," "The Eucharist," "Time and Eternity," "Heaven and Earth," "The Essence of the Spiritual Nature and Corporeality," "Christianity the Truth and Completion of the Human." Though written independently, they yet stand in close relation to each other, and rest upon a common theological ground-view. The key-note to the whole is faith—faith in its deepest and broadest sense as the unity of knowing, feeling, and willing, that is, as the most central activity of the soul. Under the guidance of this faith the regenerated Christian mind goes out in never-satiated thirst after the deep significance of the truths of revelation. The ancient Church creeds, venerable as they are, are not the highest attainable expression of the deep things of God; on the contrary, the mind of the Church may and should, in every age, aspire to a deeper and higher comprehension and construction of revealed theology. Otherwise the life of the Church is in danger of declining into an idolization of the latter, and into a shallow practicism. Dr. Schöberlein has directed his faith-guided speculations chiefly in two directions—to "the highest heights and the deepest depths of the kingdom of God." The highest factor is the Divine love, and the lowest the corporeality of the creature. The innermost center and the outermost periphery of the Divine kingdom are the spheres of Christian mystery proper. As a whole, the book offers much stimulating food for Christian thought. It will fully satisfy very few, even of the author's own Church; for it insists that even the Lutheran symbols largely need reconstruction. A redeeming feature of it is that it every-where bases itself closely upon the plain word of God. The question is, however, whether it does not in some points elicit from the sacred texts other doctrines than their true implications.

A very interesting feature of the work is its discussion of the unity of the Divine and the human in Christ. The author is not only dissatisfied with the view common in Anglo-Saxon theology, but also with the modern German idea of a *κένωσις*, a temporary self-divestment on the part of the Son of God of his divine attributes, or, at least, of their activity. But the view which he proposes in their stead, and which is too complicated to be stated here, seems to us to involve even more difficulties than the others. It agrees with the *κένωσις* theory in discarding any thing like a double personality and a twofold consciousness in Christ, and insists that

even during his human manifestation he still retained his divine consciousness, and, together with the Father and the Spirit, ruled the universe. His entering into, and his return out of, the conditions of time, occupied as it were only the space of a mathematical point in his eternal existence form, and hence involved no interruption whatever of his eternal activity.

The essay on atonement (p. 90) is perhaps as able a presentation and defense of the orthodox view as is anywhere to be found. It appeared originally in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie.*

Another marked feature of the book, and one which in some points will collide with the habitual ways of thinking in the majority of Protestant Churches, is the constant treatment of man, not as mere spirit, but as spirit, soul, and body, and the bringing of the incarnation of the Redeemer into a direct *realistic* relation not only to man's soul, but also to his natural life, his body. Many of the thoughts here presented are worthy of candid consideration; if we mistake not they will convince us that modern Protestantism is too much inclined to a one-sided abstract spiritism, and to an unscriptural disesteem of the nature-phase of man. To the average Protestant, the doctrine of the resurrection seems like a very unimportant matter—one that might almost be lost sight of without detriment to the symmetry of Christian life and thought. And yet how different was it in the minds of the Apostles! How large a place is given to it, both in their preaching and in their writings! Has not Protestantism, in reacting against the gross realism of Romanism, gone a little too far into the opposite extreme? However this may be, the learned and elaborate discussions of Schöberlein on the significance of the body, the nature of the resurrection body, the relation of Christ's unglorified to his glorified body, and of his glorified body to his eternal divinity, will amply repay the labor of a thorough study.

The spirit that pervades the whole work is admirably charitable, earnest, and devout.

Uber Nationale Erziehung. (On National Education.) *Vom Verfasser der "Briefe über Berliner Erziehung."* Leipzig, 1872: B. G. Teubner.

This book of 240 large, closely-printed pages is of great interest to all educators, for several reasons. It is a thorough discussion of the whole German system of education, but especially of its higher departments—gymnasial, university, and female education. It is a candid criticism of the merits and defects of the system, and an earnest advocacy of certain wide-reaching improvements,

While treating exclusively of German education, it abounds in suggestions that would be profitable to educators every-where. The author of the work has seen fit to withhold his name, but it is easy to infer, both from the stir made by his previous work, "Letters on Berlin Education," and by a glance at the spirit of the present one, that he is an experienced teacher and a liberal thinker. The book starts out with the suggestion that, as now the German nation has at last attained to an approximate political unity, so it is opportune for the educators of the nation to set about inaugurating a combined movement toward the development of a better and more strictly German national character as the future recipient and sole guarantee of the stability of the national unity. This character is made to consist in clearness and independency of thought and in rounded equilibrium of propension. Taking aptness to produce this result as a criterion of the soundness of every phase and feature of existing institutions, he proceeds to apply it in detail to all the studies of the ten years of gymnasial drill, and to the subjects treated and methods prevalent in the four faculties of the university. Of the many points made by the book we can mention only a few: The ten years (nine to nineteen) gymnasial course is not too long a preparation for the university, but the spirit of the teaching is defective. It aims too much at a mechanical cramming of the head with undigested facts. Its spirit is pedantic, and it tends to generate pedants. It should rather aim at stimulating autonomous thinking. It treats the pupil too servilely; it should begin earlier in the course to awaken his sense of manhood and self-respect by addressing him as *Sie* instead of *Du*. It should, toward the last of the ten years, introduce some features of the freedom of university study. On passing from the gymnasium to the university, the author finds occasion for still greater reforms—though he is careful to say that Germany has nothing to learn from the great schools of other nations. The prime requisite for training capable servants of the State in the learned professions is practical teachers. Many very learned professors have no talent for teaching. The lecture system is right in itself, but it needs complementing. There should be a "seminary" in each department for giving the students practical training in the subject in hand, under the guidance of a skillful drill-master. Otherwise many of the students pass their three or four years in a fruitless mechanical writing down of what they passively hear. In respect to the teaching *personnel*, some changes are loudly called for. Professors too old to do profitable work should no longer be paid

full salaries, (and thus incapacitate the authorities to promote able young men,) but should be excused from labor, and retired on moderate pensions. In regard to examinations and promotions, greater stress should be laid on oral than on written examinations, but a still greater stress on the direct judgment of those who taught the applicants. On coming to the subject of female education, the usually clear-headed author suddenly loses his common sense and becomes all at once violently reactionary. This part of his work has no appropriateness for American womanhood. His opinions here are in fact simply monstrous. He hesitates not to aver that the higher female schools of Germany are an unmitigated evil, affording no truly womanly culture, and fatally prejudicing their pupils against the duties of woman's natural life-sphere. With the exception of this last feature, we heartily commend this work to all German-reading American pedagogues.

Die Grenzen des confessionellen Elementes im Bereiche der sittlichen Gemeinschaft. (The Limits of the Confessional Element in the Social Sphere.) Von Dr. W. Falckenheimer. Cassel, 1872.

An attempt by an orthodox moderate liberal to fix the proper limits to the action of the secular and the religious powers in lands where State and Church are more or less organically united. The task is far from easy. The proper attitude of the State to Church property, to Church festivals, to marriage and divorce, to religious corporations, etc., is a perplexing question. History is largely made up of the strifes that have arisen along the border line. So long as State and Church are organically connected the strifes will continue. There is too much human passion in them both to remain peacefully co-ordinate. The one will continually strive to subordinate the other. The only practical solution of the problem is either an absolute organic unity of the two—a theocracy or hierocracy—or their absolute separation and independency. Nor is the celebrated maxim, "A free Church in a free State," the highest wisdom. It should read, "Free Church *and* free State." The State and the Church having properly no organic relations, need not be conterminous at all. One State may embrace many Churches; but equally well, if not better, may one Church embrace many States. Indeed, the Church has no natural limits; its legislation applies equally to all men of all zones; the whole earth may be embraced in one Church, whereas State legislation has to

be adapted to the geographic and climatic peculiarities of each race and country.

Dr. Falckenheimer looks for help to Rothe's theory, that the State is finally to absorb the Church. He would therefore restrict the confessional element to the strictly religious sphere, and regard the State as already a sort of higher Church, charged with conserving the more general interests of morality, and even of religion.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Life of the Rev. Alfred Cookman. With some account of his Father, the Rev. George Grimston Cookman. By HENRY B. RIDGAWAY, D.D. With an Introduction by the Rev. R. S. FOSTER, LL.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Pp. 480. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

Among modern contributions to the biographical wealth of the Church, few are equal to Dr. Ridgaway's Life of Alfred Cookman. So beautiful a theme, in the hands of so ready a writer, could hardly fail to produce a beautiful result. The volume is eminently a delineation of character. It narrates little of incident, little of anecdote, nothing of adventure. The events and scenes which it describes all belong to the living present, and lack the enchantment which distance sometimes lends to the view. The author invites us simply to the contemplation of a human life in which divine grace wrought a good work, and which shone more and more unto the perfect day.

Alfred Cookman was the eldest son of the Rev. George G. Cookman, who went down into an ocean grave in the steamship President in 1841, but whose name is yet as ointment poured forth. He was born in Columbia, Pa., January 4, 1828, and died in the city of Newark, N. J., November 13, 1871, in the forty-fourth year of his age. A subject of deep religious impressions almost from infancy, he gave his heart to Christ in solemn covenant when he was only a little over nine years of age. He preached his first sermon when he was only seventeen years old, was called into the itinerant ministry under the authority of a presiding elder the next year, and was received by the Philadelphia Conference on trial in 1848. His appointments were Attleborough, (Pa.,) Delaware City Circuit, (Del.,) Germantown, Kensington, Westchester, Harrisburgh, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New York city, Wilmington, (Del.,) and Newark, (N. J.) He was a member of the

National Camp-Meeting Association, and entered with great enthusiasm into their plans and labors. Mr. Cookman was well known, not only as an earnest and eloquent, acceptable and successful minister of Christ, commending himself, like Paul, "to every man's conscience in the sight of God," but as a confessor and ardent advocate of that grace which bringeth full salvation. The least that can be said of him, in connection with the doctrine named, is that his life was not inconsistent with the profession which he made. Among the names which the Church, with humble, grateful joy, inscribes upon her tablets as examples of the purifying, elevating power of divine grace, there is a place for the name of Alfred Cookman.

The biographer is to be congratulated, not only upon the pleasant character of the work set before him, but the success with which he has done it. He was long and intimately acquainted with Mr. Cookman; he appreciated him; he loved him; and to a kindred spirit we can imagine no more grateful task than the delineation of such a friend when he is gone from earth, but gone in such wise that it can hardly be said of him that he died, but rather that he "was not, for God took him."

A Man of God; or, Providence and Grace Exemplified in a Memoir of the Rev. Peter M'Owan. Compiled chiefly from his Letters and Papers. By Rev. JOHN M'OWAN. Edited by G. Osborn, D.D. 12mo., pp. 367. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1873.

The devout mind will receive with pleasure this record of a good man's life. Its special interest will doubtless be for the most part limited to those who personally knew him; but to all lovers of the Lord Jesus, and in particular those who belong to the Methodist family, so excellent a biography of a Wesleyan minister who for more than half a century was an honored and successful pastor cannot fail to prove acceptable. Methodism found him a youth in his Scottish home, under an unevangelical ministry, surrounded by a general religious apathy, and brought him to Christ. The works of Fletcher uprooted his Scotch Calvinism. At the age of twenty-two he was placed in his first circuit, and thenceforth his life was consecrated to the one work of an itinerant preacher. He appears in these pages as a devoted Christian, an eloquent preacher, a faithful pastor, a tender husband, a fond parent, a man ready for any service, however great the toil or sacrifice, and ambitious only to do his duty faithfully and well so as to be approved by his Conference and final Judge. Such

men as Moore, Newton, Bunting, and Jackson were his personal friends. His labors were in such places as Glasgow, London, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and Bristol. An account of him might perhaps be written which would more fully show his connection with the men and great events of his time, but none could better exhibit the fully rounded character formed by the operations of Providence in his itinerant life and divine grace revealed in his soul. The volume is largely made up of his correspondence and extracts from other manuscripts, which the compiler has used with excellent judgment.

Spiritualism and Necromancy. By Rev. A. B. MORRISON, of the Southern Illinois Conference. 16mo., pp. 203. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

We confess some surprise at this book. It is well written, the spirit is good, but it concedes far more than we are willing to admit. Its theory, plainly stated in the author's own words, is simply this: "Spiritualism is a snare of demons, by which they deceive poor bewildered mortals by personating in the *seance* the friend whose spirit you call for."—P. 165. This clearly concedes that the phenomena of spirit-rapping are supernatural, produced by evil beings, and that the deception in the matter is in the demons pretending to be the souls of the friends with whom the victim is trying to communicate. We regard spirit-rapping, as worked by the *mediums* who conjure up imaginary ghosts, but take care to demand real dollars for their services, as one of the meanest and brassiest of the cheats whereby the cunning make merchandise of the weak. This, in this part of the land, is the public verdict. There may be, here and there, for aught we know, a demented individual who imagines that the dead can be induced to beat on a table an answer to any trifling question that may be put to them. There may be a few who are in doubt whether alleged phenomena are mere trickery, or the result of certain mysterious laws of the human mind; but the claim of supernatural agency is utterly scouted by the intelligent as well as the religious portion of the community. This verdict is the right one.

Miscellaneous.

The Words of the New Testament, as Altered by Transmission and Ascertained by Modern Criticism, for Popular Use. By Rev. WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism, Aberdeen; and Rev. ALEXIS ROBERTS, D.D., Professor of Humanity, St. Andrews. 12mo., pp. 262. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1873.

The attention not only of scholars, but of thoughtful readers generally, has been attracted to the subject of the New Testament text. This interest has been enhanced by the approaching revision of our English version. This volume was therefore wisely intended to meet a "popular" want. It goes over the whole ground of errors in the text, their disclosure by the discovery of manuscripts, the methods of textual revision, and the results obtained in showing the wonderful accuracy of the general text, and the curious variations and conclusions with regard to a few important texts. Though prepared by two very eminent biblical scholars, the work is adapted for "the people." No Greek or Hebrew type alarms the English reader; and the entire volume is perfectly clear to the average Sunday-school teacher.

Old Rome and New Italy. (Recuer dos de Italian.) By EMILIO CASTELAR, Author of "The Republican Movement in Europe," now publishing in "Harper's Magazine." Translated by Mrs. ARTHUR ARNOLD. 12mo., pp. 301. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Castelar assumes as his base the Hegelian philosophy, and for his superstructure a universal humanitarian religion, which fuses all religious systems into a yet undeveloped unity, and inspires the loftiest yet most vague hopes of human progress to a future earthly indefinite yet transcendent good. Whether he possesses any clear faith in personal immortality or not, is a question which our reading of his essays does not enable us distinctly to answer. His style is one continuous strain of lofty rhetoric, philosophy, politics, and religion, rolling forward in one grand flow of oratory, verging often into prose poetry. He is a stimulating, often instructive, oftener a delusive thinker and writer.

The Great Riots of New York, 1712 to 1873. Including a Full and Complete Account of the Four Days' Riot of 1863. By Hon. J. T. HEADLEY, Author of "Napoleon and his Marshals," "Washington and his Generals," "Sacred Mountains," "Sacred Homes and Martyrs," etc. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 359. New York: E. B. Treat.

Triumphing over Death. A Narrative of the Closing Scenes of the Life of William Gordon, M.D., F.L.S., of Kingston-upon-Hull. By NEWMAN HALL, D.D. 12mo., pp. 263. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Biblical Commentary, on the Old Testament. By C. F. KEIL, D.D., and F. DELITZSCH, D.D., Professors of Theology. The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. By C. F. KIEL. Translated from the German by SOPHIA TAYLOR. 8vo., pp. 380. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1873.

The Old Testament commentary of Keil and Delitzsch, now in process of translation, is a very acceptable gift from orthodox and evangelical Germany. It maintains with rich erudition the true Christian conservative grounds in regard to the sacred canon, and meets the cavils of "modern thought" with still more "modern" refutation.

Elder Park Garden. By Mrs. ALFRED PAYNE. With three Illustrations. Large 16mo., pp. 222. New York: Nelson & Phillips. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

How Marjorie Watched. By Miss WASHINGTON. Three Illustrations. Large 16mo., pp. 161. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

Through Trials to Triumph. A Story of Boys' School Life. By Miss H. A. PUTNAM. Three Illustrations. Large 16mo., pp. 277. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

Gipsy's Early Days. By JOSEPHINE POLLARD. With Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 182. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

The Life of Trust. Being a Narrative of the Lord's Dealings with George Müller. Written by Himself. With an Introduction by FRANCES WAYLAND. A new Edition, from the former issue, revised, enlarged, and improved, with the History continued to the present time. With fine cuts of the Orphan Houses. 12mo., pp. 491. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1873.

Eclectic Classical Series. A Grammar of the Latin Language. By G. K. BARTHOLOMEW. 12mo,, pp. 276. Cincinnati and New York: Wilson, Hinkle, & Co.

INDEX.

Antislavery reform, and Theodore Parker.....Page 533
Arator, the Christian poet..... 335
Arcani Disciplina 337
Arianism, and the Sonship of Christ..... 569
Apocalypse Translated and Expounded.... 341
Augustine's view of perdition. 676
Automatic life..... 521

Business men, Lessons to..... 59, 61
Bismarck and Young Roumania..... 126
Birthplace of Luther, controversy unsettled 142
Blasphemy, approach to, by Theo. Parker.. 404

Calvin; his despotism..... 527
Calvinism in Church of England..... 476
Calvinism, The Position of Article, by Dr. Aikman..... 291
Seldom uttered in American pulpits..... 292
Views of the different Churches 293
Position of Methodism upon..... 295
Changes in doctrine..... 299
Or Augustinian theology..... 301
According to Calvin's Institutes..... 305
According to Barnes, Hodge, Taylor..... 307
Present pulpit utterances concerning 315
Camp-meeting riots in Peter Cartwright's time..... 78
Cartwright, Peter, and Preaching in the West. Second Article, by M. Cucheval Clavigny 69
Journal and autobiography of..... 69
Birth, parents, and childhood of..... 70
Conversion of..... 71
Prepares to preach 72
His *resumé* of labors 73
Extended circuits and meager salaries of. 73
Experience of..... 74
Hesitancy to preach to Yankees..... 75
Earnestness in saving souls..... 75
And General Jackson..... 77
Experience in camp-meeting riots, of.... 78
Preaches before Boston General Conf.... 81
Political history of 81
Dr. Jobson's account of..... 83
Fogyism of 83
Lives to see prosperity of Methodism.... 84
Castellar's Old Rome and New Italy..... 699
Cerebration 516
Channing and Theodore Parker compared.. 26
Christ's resurrection a proof of ours..... 636
Christ, The Sonship of. Article, by Prof. Raymond 562
Precise import of the term..... 563
Based on his resurrection..... 564
Based on his Messiahship..... 564
Divine signification of..... 565
Inscrutableness of 568
And Arianism 569
Distinction between deity and divinity... 571
In the creeds of the Churches..... 573

Christian Purity. Article, by Rev. Lewis R. Dunn.....Page 206
Definition of..... 208
Attainable 210
Gradual or instantaneous 215
Degrees of..... 224
Cookman, Alfred..... 696
Church and State 695
—— of future, Universal priesthood in.... 69
—— Relation of Infants..... 131
—— Infant baptism and regeneration 132
—— Infants' condition correspondent to regeneration in adults 134
—— Views of Fletcher, Wesley, Fisk..... 135
Condition of Church Membership..... 610
Congressional Investig'n into the Ku-Klux. 92
Cruelties of the Ku-Klux..... 98

Dangerous Classes and their Treatment, The. Article, by J. F. Richmond 455
Condition of, previous to Christianity.... 455
Principles of Christianity applied to..... 457
Of foreign origin..... 458
Romish Church a source of 460
Spring from orphanage, "drink," transmitted tendencies to evil, ignorance. 460
Remedy for..... 468
Darwinism of Mr. Whitney..... 345
Death of Theodore Parker..... 560
Depravity, Infant..... 685
—— Meyer's views of. 686
Dishonesties, Literary, of Theodore Parker..... 15, 37
Divinity and deity of Christ, Attempted distinction between..... 571
Doctrines of religion, Three great, according to Theodore Parker..... 383
Dogmatics, Comparative, inattention to, both in England and America..... 680
Dream-Physiology of Andre Delrieu 519

Education in Germany..... 694
—— Female in Germany..... 695
English Methodism, Loss of propagating energy..... ... 85
English New Testament, Revision of 338
Errors in..... 339
Strange pro-Calvinistic uses of words in. 340
Ethics of the Bible do not forbid the abandonment of ethics to the politician.... 352
Evangelicals maligned by Theodore Parker. 543
Evil, Theodore Parker's distinction between absolute and partial..... 406
Evolutionists, Problem for..... 523

Faith, Chamberlayne on Saving. Article, by Rev. Daniel D. D. Buck, D.D..... 609
One condition, according to General Rules. 610
Illustrated 613
Subjective and objective..... 614
Objections considered..... 615

Faith, Saving:
Fletcher's views of.....Page 617
Is not faith matured..... 620
Inconsistency in General Rules concerning..... 625
Faith, Mysteries of..... 692
Female education in Germany..... 695
Forces in matter..... 641
Foreign Literary Intelligence.....150, 498, 672
Foreign Religious Intelligence—
Second Congress of Old Catholics..... 145
The Greek Church..... 147, 495
Roman Catholicism..... 493
Froude on Calvinism..... 505

Geologic man; Skeletons of, discovered.... 522
Germany, Education in..... 694
Government of Young Roumania..... 118

Hell, Controversy on, between Burr and Walworth..... 503
Hermonigilt, Insurrection of..... 143
Hilgenfeld, Prof., on United States..... 663
History of Young Roumania..... 111
Hodge's, Dr., Theology; its errors 500
Holy Ghost little recognized in Romish sacraments 603
Hooker on sacraments..... 602
Humanity immortal..... 159

Intoxicants, Earliest kinds of 409
Intoxication, Evils of early, manifested.... 410
Intuitions, Grand primary, according to Theodore Parker..... 886

Jackson, General, and Peter Cartwright.... 77
Jephthah's Vow. Article, by Rev. M. S. Terry..... 266
Language of..... 268
Excusable from ignorance..... 278
Made in degenerate times..... 280
Sequel of the history of..... 283
Uttered, and must be paid..... 284
Wrong explanations of..... 287
Johnson, Reverdy, Indignation of, against the Ku-Klux..... 98

Keil's Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament..... 699
Ku-Klux Conspiracy, The. Article, by S. G. Arnold, Esq.....
Amnesty contrasted with..... 89
Stimulated by the Fourteenth Amendment 90
Congressional investigation into..... 92
Trial at Raleigh against..... 97
Indignation of Mr. Reverdy Johnson at.. 98
Persecution of Mr. Justice by... 98
Cruelties to Mr. White by 102
Cruelties against Dr. Winsmith..... 104
Causeless whipping of Mr. Champion by. 104
Great outrages by..... 104
More atrocities by..... 106
Hatred of Alabama State University by. 106
Atrocities against ministers of the M. E. Church by..... 107
Burning of school-houses by..... 107
Hatred of education felt by..... 106
Ku-Klux defended by Dr. Summers..... 354

Lagarde, Prof., Views of Christianity 664
Land of the Veda. Article, by Dr. J. W. Waugh..... 230
Early history of..... 230
Few orthodox Buddhists..... 234
Religion in 241
Luther's opinions of universal priesthood. 43, 45, 49

Martensen on sacraments.....Page 602
Matter, An Inquiry into the Nature of. Article, by Rev. J. W. Armstrong, D.D 640
Repellant force of, under pressure..... 641
Attractive force of 642
Ever seeking equilibrium..... 643
Experiments in liquid..... 644
Immaterial nature of..... 646
Additional facts concerning..... 647
Propositions concerning, universally accepted..... 650
Mediation. Article, by Prof. Bannister.... 254
Necessity of..... 255
Method of 257
Foreknown 259
Messiahship of Christ the basis of his sonship 564
Methodism, Dangers to 86
—— And the other denominations..... 654
—— Practicalness of..... 655
—— A "present" Church..... 656
—— A political Church..... 657
—— Defective in retaining converts..... 657
—— A Church of reforms..... 658
—— Makes converts for other Churches... 659
—— American doctrines of, not those of the Thirty-nine Articles 681
Methodist local ministry..... 56
—— theology..... 138
Meyer's views of infant depravity..... 686
—— Commentary..... 691
Millennium, Post 342
—— Strange arithmetic about 342
—— World overstocked in..... 342
Millinger's Words of the New Testament.. 699
Mind moves matter only by matter..... 652
Moehler on sacraments 602
Money, Passion for, seldom relinquished... 63
Mornay, Philippe Duplessis..... 489
Mystery of the resurrection..... 631

"Nepenthe," Origin of the word..... 409
Nitzsch, Carl Immanuel. Article, by Prof. Lacroix..... 576
High appreciation of..... 576
Birth and education of..... 577
Becomes deacon of Univ. Church..... 579
On doctrine of the Trinity..... 580
Becomes professor at Bonn 582
And Schleiermacherian theology..... 583
His system of Christian doctrine..... 585
His great literary labors..... 585
His popularity and wide reading..... 507
Becomes professor at Berlin..... 589
In politico-theological convulsions..... 590
His work on practical theology 591
Death of..... 594
Prominence of his family..... 595

Optics, Weak 523

Paleolithic period 140
—— Topography of..... 141
—— Implements of..... 141
Paleoliths—Indoctrination of workmen concerning..... 486
—— Illimitable quantity of..... 486
—— No improvement in manufacture of.. 487
Parker, Theodore. Articles, by Prof. Prentiss..... 5, 383, 583
Biographies, undue reverence for..... 5
Birthplace, ancestry, childhood, and college life..... 6
Teaches, and enters theological school... 15
Disposition to exaggeration..... 15
Theol. opinions and religious experience. 17
Ordination..... 26
Channing compared with..... 26
Lectures on Inspiration..... 29
Gets beyond Unitarianism 31

Parker, Theodore:
Preaches an ordination sermon .....Page 82
Unitarian rage and ostracism of..... 83
Travels to Europe..... 37
Labors and boastfulness of..... 37
Literary dishonesties 39
Discourse of religion by..... 40
Contrasted with Wesley..... 35
Harshness and sarcasm of..... 41
Theological position of..... 383
Defects of, as a thinker..... 388
His self-complacency compared with the true modes of great thinkers..... 393
Theological errors and inconsistencies of. 393
Studies Buddhism and three other religious sects, and greatly exaggerates his performance..... 394
Exhibits little research into Buddhism .. 395
Opinions on sin..... 401
Confusion and contraction in theology of. 404
On Providence..... 403
As a social reformer..... 533
And antislavery reform..... 533
Maligns evangelicals..... 548
And the great revival of 1857..... 552
Ill health of..... 556
Opinions on death..... 557
Death and funeral ceremonies..... 560
Pelagius' views of perdition..... 676
Persecutions of education by Ku-Klux 106
Personality of God necessary to prayer.... 508
Politicalism of M. E. Church, South..... 348
Politics in the Church..... 351
Political History of Peter Cartwright..... 81
—— Parties in Young Roumania..... 127
Predestination in Primitive Church..... 502
—— Not by "good pleasure of God's will" but by his beneficence..... 684
Pressensé on universal priesthood..... 51
—— On reunion of Churches..... 492
Priesthood of the People. Article, by Rev. Abel Stevens, LL.D..... 43
Stand-point of Reformation and Primitive Church on..... 43
Luther's declarations of..... 43, 45, 49
Contrary to prelacy 47
In Church at Jerusalem..... 47
Hierarchy arose from 48
John Wesley on..... 49
Essential equality of all saints inferred from..... 50
Pressensé on..... 51
Practice and opinions of early Christians on..... 51
Does not detract from "divine call"..... 53
And Methodism..... 53
And ordination..... 54
Illusions of ecclesiasticism, on 54
And "preaching" 55
Reformers in advance of present day on.. 56
Methodist local ministry, and 56
Universal obligation of Christian labor, inferred from 59
Confers responsibility on business men... 59
Relation of population's increase to..... 61
With reference to America's great future. 61
Consecration in secular life, and..... 62
Love of riches incompatible with..... 62
Increase of natural wealth and..... 64
Includes the humblest..... 65
Includes Christian women..... 65
Papal errors in Protestantism contrary to 67
In the Church of the future..... 69
Primeval Man 169
—— A refutation of Darwinism 170
Protestant reaction against Romish realism too great 693

Remedy for the dangerous classes..... 468

Reprobation, The Doctrine of. Article, by Rev. Dr. Warren.....Page 431
Definition of..... 431
Scripture proof for 432
God's cause for..... 433
What it includes..... 436
Means by which God executes..... 439
What proportion of the race included in. 441
Infants included in..... 442
Why God created men for..... 445
Why means of grace are vouchsafed to those included under the decree of.. 446
Justice and propriety of, unconditional... 447
How men ought to feel under the decree of 452
Horribleness of doctrine of..... 454
Resurrection, The. Article, by Rev. G. F. Cox 640
No law process 630
Mystery of, does not invalidate the fact.. 631
Objections obviated 632
True ground of hope for..... 636
Resurrection considered as basis of Christ's Sonship..... 564
Retribution, different phases of present day belief..... 676
—— Romish view of..... 677
—— Edwards' opinions of, hypothetical .. 678
Revivals hindered by Theodore Parker.... 552
Romanism, Protestant reaction against the realism of, gone too far..... 693
Romish Church—a cause of the dangerous classes..... 460
Rothe on the Passion of Christ..... 514

Sacrament, Nature of a Christian. Article, by Rev. A. H. Ames..... 596
Relative importance of the 596
Two leading theories concerning..... 597
An instrument conferring peculiar grace. 597
A sign or token 598
View of Romish Church concerning 598
View of the Lutheran Church concerning. 599
View of Church of England concerning.. 599
Difficulties of Romish theories concern'g. 603
A channel of grace..... 605
True definition of argument therefor.... 607
Sacraments not a clerical monopoly 51
Sanctification and justification compared to a son and servant, by Mr. Wesley..... 623
Santa Domingo 346
Social Science, Cary's. Article, by Dr. G. M. Steele..... 357
Man is object of 359
Doctrine of value in..... 360
Doctrine of land and rent in 464
Errors of the Malthusian theory regarding 369
Error of J. Stuart Mills regarding..... 370
Distinction between trade and commerce. 376
Producer and consumer 380
Son of God, a divine, not human title..... 565
Southern Review, a politico-ecclesiastical Review..... 321
A political organ of a professedly non-political Church..... 322
Theory of secession in..... 326
Defamation of President Lincoln by..... 326
Further defamations by 327
Spiritualism 699
Statistics of liquor sales..... 427
Supernatural phenomena..... 519

Temperance Reform, The. Article, by Rev. Dr. Crane..... 409
Origin of..... 410
Various societies under..... 411
Spread of..... 415
Total abstinence in..... 418
Statistics of..... 427

Theodicy, Bledsoe's.....Page 154
Unitarianism ostracises Theodore Parker.. 33
Unity of Divine and human in Christ.....692
Unity of the Christian Church, Pressensé on..... 665
—— Obstacles to..... 665
Unity of the Physical World. Article, by President Winchell..... 181
1. Order and uniformities of the solar system..... 184
2. Extension of the laws of the solar system to the fixed stars..... 191
3. Table of elements recognized in the heavenly bodies..... 205
Universal obligation to Christian labor.... 59
Universalism and Orthodoxy..... 679

Vedas and Vedic religion, The..... 344
—— Are all psalms..... 344
—— Earliest literature extant..... 344

Washington, Treaty of..... 528
Wealth; its Relation to Consecration..... 62
Wesley, John, and Theodore Parker compared..... 35
Wesley on Universal Priesthood .....Page 49
Women Christian, included in priesthood of people..... 65
Wuttke, Dr. Adolph..... 525

Young Roumania. Article, by Prof. William Wells..... 111
Its history and language..... 111
Its *status* toward Turkey..... 112
Its present king..... 113
Inhabitants of, consider themselves modern Romans..... 114
Prof. Bucharest's lectures on..... 114
Treatment of foreigners in..... 114
A land of inconsistencies..... 115
Its soil..... 115
Its morals and constitution..... 116
Dissatisfaction of nobility..... 117
Its party of "Reds," and their organ..... 117
Its government 118
The Jews in..... 119
Its peculiar political situation..... 125
The Germans persecuted in..... 126
Bismarck and..... 126
Political parties..... 127

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LV.—1873.

JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

THEODORE PARKER 5
Rev. George Prentice, Professor in Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE PEOPLE 43
Rev. A. Stevens, LL.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

PETER CARTWRIGHT, AND PREACHING IN THE WEST. (Second Article.) 69
M. Cucheval-Clavigny. From the Revue des Deux Mondes.

THE KU-KLUX CONSPIRACY 89
S. G. Arnold, Esq., Washington, D. C.

YOUNG ROUMANIA 111
Professor William Wells, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 130

Foreign Religious Intelligence 144

Foreign Literary Intelligence 150

Quarterly Book-Table 154

APRIL NUMBER.

THE UNITY OF THE PHYSICAL WORLD 181
President Winchell, Syracuse University.

CHRISTIAN PURITY 206
Rev. Lewis R. Dunn, Paterson, N. J.

THE LAND OF THE VEDA 230
Rev. J. W. Waugh, D.D., Missionary to India.

MEDIATION 254
Professor Bannister, Evanston, Ill.

JEPHTHAH'S VOW 266
Rev. M. S. Terry, A.M., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

THE POSITION OF CALVINISM 291
Rev. Robert Aikman, D.D., Madison, N. J.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 320

Quarterly Book-Table 338

107780

107780
Methodist Quarterly Review
v. 55
v. 25 (4S)
1873

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME

Methodist Quarterly Review
v. 55
v. 25 (4S)
1873

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.